VOL. XI. (No. 2) OCTOBER, 1913 No. 42

THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY

PUBLISHED BY
THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY
NEW YORK, U.S.A.

The Theosophical Quarterly.

Published by The Theosophical Society at
159 Warren Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

In Europe single numbers may be obtained from and subscriptions sent to Dr. Archibald Keightley, 46 Brook Street, London, W., England.

Price for non-members, $1.00 per annum; single copies, 25 cents.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XI., No. 2.

PAGE

NOTES AND COMMENTS 95
THE EASTERN CHURCH. I 102
LETTERS TO FRIENDS. VIII 109
BERGSON'S PHILOSOPHICAL POSITION. I 114
SHANKARACHARYA'S CATECHISM. IV 124
EARLY ENGLISH MYSTICS. IV 129
CONCERNING THE REAL AND CONCERNING SHADOWS 139
THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN 144
SOME ASPECTS OF THEOSOPHY 150
PRACTICAL THEOSOPHY 157
WHY I JOINED THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY 161
ON THE SCREEN OF TIME 166
THEOSOPHY AND THE FAMILY 174
REVIEWS 177
Theosophisches Leben; Gitanjali (Song Offerings); Dante and the Mystics; The Master; *The Constructive Quarterly.*
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS 183
The Field of the Western Avatar; Manifestation; How May we Know the Master? Self-questioning; Difficulties in Obedience; Who is Eligible for Membership in the T. S.?
THEOSOPHICAL CONVENTIONS 187
British National Branch; Union of German Branches.

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

The principal aim and object of this Society is to form the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste or color. The subsidiary objects are: The study of ancient and modern religions, philosophies and sciences, and the demonstration of the importance of such study; and the investigation of the unexplained laws of nature and the psychical powers latent in man.

Entered July 17, 1903, at Brooklyn, N. Y., as second-class matter, under Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

Copyright, 1913, by The Theosophical Society.

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
OCT 6 1913

NOTES AND COMMENTS

OCTOBER 1913

The Theosophical Society, as such, is not responsible for any opinion or declaration in this magazine, by whomsoever expressed, unless contained in an official document.

Religious Experience

RELIGIOUS experience is universal. In saying this, we do not mean that all human beings, men, women and children, are in present possession of religious experience, though there is a sense in which this is true, but rather that religious experience is the same in all times, for all races, with all temperaments; that this, more than anything else, binds mankind together, and makes it possible and necessary to speak of humanity as a single life. The culture of races and epochs varies endlessly, as does their language and physical type, as between the red races, the black, the yellow, the white, but in essence their religious experience is one, resting on a common principle, leading to a common life.

The reason that religious experience has the universal character, common to all peoples, through all times, seems to be this: it is a necessary stage in the development of the soul, a passage from one condition to another condition of life, from an old to a new realm of experience. And all who quit the old, and pass to the new, must go by this way, just as all those who, living on the eastern bank of a river, desire to change their abode to the western bank, must cross the river in essentially the same way, no matter what tribe they belong to, what village they inhabit.

In this simile, the eastern bank of the river is the familiar one of personal life; the essential character of which is, that it is an existence, half-animal, half-human, which is largely motived by self-interest: by the sense of a separate self, which must be defended, supported, advanced, by one's own vigilant effort, in rivalry, in contest often, whether of force or craft, against the like personal selves of others. One is consciously or unconsciously fighting for one's own hand.

And, just as in a struggle or contest of any kind, whether in a street brawl, a game of hazard, or a larger battle of armies, the rigor of the contest, bending all faculties of will and vigilance to a single point, cuts off the power of attention in other directions, so that there is oblivion of all other things, whether duties or dangers, in the single thought of the contest; so in this struggle for self, there is oblivion, a hemming in of consciousness, a narrowing of horizons, a blindness to many things, which the same spirit, if cool and detached, would instantly see to be vital and real.

The weapons in this warfare for self are as varied as those in an armory. The main purpose is, that the self shall be strengthened and defended; and expedients of every sort are tried, to accomplish it. The whole range of ambitions, the search of power, of wealth, of fame, of recognized achievement: all these are but weapons whereby the self seeks to fortify its position, holding out against natural forces, holding its own against rival selves also in violent contest, holding its own, also, though in this case almost always unconsciously, blindly, against the larger spiritual life which is destined to succeed the life of the personal self.

Ambitions and desires are weapons in this contest. So are all the vices and sins whereby we seek stimulants and sensations for our personal selves, or seek oblivion of danger or failure. All, without exception, are the means whereby the personal self seeks to fortify its position, to heighten the personal sense, to make keen and vivid that kind of consciousness, the essence of which is the sense of a separate being and a separate fate, to be upheld and defended at all costs.

We spoke of personal life as half-animal, half-human. As it is an emergence from simple animal life, the successor of that, just as it is in turn destined to be succeeded by a wider and deeper life, it has carried over from the simple life of animals many elements and powers, which are gradually transformed, or deformed, under the stress of personal desire. Here arises much confusion, a blending of forces, half-earthly, half-astral, by which the personal self is presently beset and encumbered, making its darkness deeper, the work of its redemption more difficult and painful.

But the time comes when the soul, having learned the lessons of personal life, as before it learned the simpler lessons which animal life teaches, is ready to pass to the next great stage of experience, to cross the river from the eastern to the western bank. And, as the crossing is in essence the same, no matter at what place on the bank of the great river of life it is undertaken, so religious experience is in essence the same, without regard to the race or creed, the time or clime, of those

who pass through it. Therefore, it may be said that religious experience is universal.

Religious experience is subversive. A characteristic of it, as universal as the experience itself, is a revision of values, a new measure of things, and especially of the very things on which the personal self set the greatest store, the very weapons which seemed most essential for the fight, and the prizes which seemed worth any effort and sacrifice. So characteristic of religious experience is this subversive force, this thorough-going revision of values, that it is worth while to illustrate it with some completeness. Three illustrations offer themselves: the neophyte Nachiketas, of the Indian Upanishad, milleniums old; the Roman emperor, Marcus Aurelius Antoninus; and the Spanish nun, Teresa of Avila: three witnesses sufficiently far apart in character and time.

Nachiketas, whose religious experience is superbly dramatized in his colloquy with Death, speaks thus to the great destroyer, who has offered him sons and grandsons of a hundred years, and much cattle, and elephants and gold and horses, wealth and length of days, and the beauties of the world:

"Tomorrow these fleeting things wear out the vigor of a mortal's powers. Even the whole of life is short; thine are chariots and dance and song.

"Not by wealth can a man be satisfied. Shall we choose wealth if we have seen thee? Shall we desire life while thou art master? But the wish I choose is truly that.

"Coming near to the unfading immortals, a fading mortal here below, and understanding, thinking on the sweets of beauty and pleasure, who would rejoice in length of days?

"This that they doubt about, O Death, what is in the great Beyond, tell me of that. This wish that draws near to the mystery, Nachiketas chooses no other wish than that."

Thus did this neophyte of most ancient India make his choice, ages ago, ages before the great renunciation of Siddhartha the compassionate, who, giving up the world, conquered the world, and became the Buddha. Here, as we have said, religious experience is subversive. There is a sudden revision, even a reversal of values. The weapons and treasures of personal life are suddenly seen to be worthless, useless, needless to a life that is stepping beyond personality.

To turn now to the Roman Emperor. Marcus Aurelius, in the second century of the Christian era, was not in name, or in his own thought, a Christian; nay, he was either indifferent or even hostile to

those who then bore the Master's name and some of whom, in the Master's name, followed courses quite adverse to the Master's teaching. In the deeper sense, the "pagan" emperor was the better Christian, far closer to the spirit and temper of the disciple; expressing certain qualities of the disciple: disinterestedness, poise, humanity, reverence, in a perfection that has rarely been excelled, rarely equalled by disciples who have been called to wear the crown of earthly empire.

Marcus Aurelius expresses with thoroughness and depth the subversive quality of religious experience, the revision of values, which the great awakening always brings:

"Soon, very soon, thou wilt be ashes or a skeleton, and either a name or not even a name; but name is sound and echo. And the things which are much valued in life are empty and rotten and trifling, and like little dogs biting one another, and little children quarrelling, laughing, and then straightway weeping. What then is there which still detains thee here?"

This is not pessimism, in the accepted sense, for the emperor was no pessimist. And is not much of what passes for pessimism to be more truly understood as a stage in religious experience, in the awakening from personal life, and the consequent revised valuation of the treasures and weapons of that life?

Fourteen centuries later, Saint Teresa expressed the same sense of personal life: "Oh, what an affliction it is for the soul, who sees herself in this state, to be obliged to return and converse with the world, and to behold the farce of this life, so badly acted and arranged! To be forced to spend so much time in the things of the body, in sleeping and eating! All this wearies the soul, which knows not how to escape from thence, for she finds herself a captive in chains. She then feels more sensibly the captivity we endure by means of our bodies, and also the misery of this life. She seems like one sold as a slave in a strange land."

We must understand this seeming pessimism rightly, whether in the Indian neophyte, the Roman emperor, or the Spanish nun. It is not that, standing as personal selves, they have gradually become disillusioned, finding the things of personal life growing ever more bitter to the taste, though this is one aspect of their experience. It is rather that they have found themselves plunged into the life which is beyond and beneath personal life; and that their sudden consciousness of this new life, with its real values, has brought a new standard of values to the things of personal life, before which they show as trivial, dross, nothingness. The essence of this new consciousness is the death of the personal self: a complete and final blotting out of that self which has fought for its own hand, against nature, against others, against divine law. The

soul suddenly realizes that it is an undivided part of the great life: that it has no separate fate which needs to be defended or which can be defended. Egotism is dead. It has died into a larger life. It is not that the man has become unconscious. On the contrary, he is now, for the first time, truly conscious; but conscious as an undivided part of the whole divine element, not as a separate self that needs defence against the rest. He becomes conscious of the oneness of all divine life, and realizes that that life is his true self.

Therefore the defences, the aims, of the fancied separate self seem to him ridiculous and futile, like withered leaves, like little dogs snapping at each other, like a farce badly played. He has stepped over into a life which supersedes these things and makes them superfluous, as completely as husk of the chrysalis is to the winged butterfly in the sunlight.

But it must not be fancied that this subversion of values makes the soul careless, anarchical, or sets it adrift on a sea of idleness. If religious experience is subversive, it is also constructive, with an intensity and a thoroughness which ordinary human life can in no-wise rival. Immersed as we are in ordinary human life, we cannot yet gain a fully illumined view of the intense, incessant building which fills the spiritual realm; but we can see that the great religious spirits are the great builders; first building, in sacrifice and terrible toil, their own splendid personalities; then building in other souls that they draw about them; then building these into orders and divine relations, like the well-tuned strings of a heavenly lyre, or the stones of a dwelling not made with hands.

Ceaseless building, intense constructive power, is, therefore, the next element of religious experience. All things are made new, through the divine element working in perfect co-operation with the exertions of the soul. And the building is to last. He builds for immortality. Eternal life is seen and known, when the obscuring encasements of the personal self are broken away, as the free air and sunshine and the loveliness of flowers are known, when the blind, dry husk of the chrysalis is broken. But the building is no longer a private fortress, possessed in exclusive separatism and hostility. It is rather a rest-house of the divine element, through which the holy breath of divine air flows unimpeded. There is a selfhood within the dwelling, but it is a divine selfhood, including, not excluding, all other souls; at one with all in the unity of the Most High.

Religious experience is humane. The revised standard of values, which makes so many of the prizes of human life seem trivial and tawdry, which shows much of its treasure to be "fool's gold," does not, therefore,

harden the heart to human sorrow, or render it scornful of human endeavor. On the contrary, only after the great spiritual rebirth is there genuine compassion, a deep love for human beings, which loves all the children of men without distinction.

It is well worth while to give examples of this generous human love; and it will give point to what we have said, if we cite them from the same sources as before, from the witnesses to the spiritual glory which shows our world the shadow-play it is. The Upanishads have given the most universal expression to this large-hearted compassion, declaring that he who has attained: "Sees all beings in Self, and Self in all beings," therefore, he will be full of tenderness for all, since Self cannot injure Self. This is the note which is struck, with splendid resonance, in the superb life of Siddhartha the Compassionate, "whose heart was heavy with a whole world's woe."

The first Upanishad phrase is almost verbally echoed by Marcus Aurelius: "Enter into every man's ruling faculty," says the Roman Emperor, "and also let every other man enter into thine." In Sanskrit, one of the names of the Self is the ruling faculty, the "inner compeller." The wise Emperor completes the expression of divine compassion: "If thou art able, correct by teaching those who do wrong; but if thou canst not, remember that forgiveness is given to thee for this purpose. The divine powers also forgive such persons; and for some purposes they even help them to get health, wealth, reputation; so kind they are. And it is in thy power also; or say, who hinders thee?" And what gentle, practical wisdom there is in this little sentence of his: "Men exist for the sake of one another. Teach them then, or bear with them."

Hear now the Spanish nun, on this theme of divine compassion. "Do you fancy," she says, of the perfect, "such hearts can love or think of none except God alone? Indeed, they love others far more, with a truer, more generous and intense affection. In a word, this is true love. These souls are ever more ready to give than to receive, even with their Creator. This, I say, merits the name of love. . . . If they care for anyone, they do not arrest their eyes on the body, but at once look into the soul, to see if it contains aught they can love, or if not, whether it has germs or inclinations which show that, by digging deep enough, they will find gold within the mine; loving this soul, no trouble wearies them, no service is too hard for them willingly to render it."

Religious experience is personal. Not in the sense in which selfish human life is personal, but with a high and divine consciousness, of which ordinary human life, ordinary personality, is seen to be the perversion, the inversion. Now, for the first time, true personality is experienced; it is felt to rest always on the oneness of the whole divine element, the

ultimate selfhood of all that is. Therefore this new and truer personality, the life on the western side of the river, is a communion of boundless joy. For, whereas ordinary human life seeks joy in separate selfhood, and never finds it there, the awakened soul finds joy in universal, divine selfhood, even without seeking it. And the universal divine element always answers the soul with a personal note. The awakened soul meets no abstraction, no attenuated breath of negative spirit, but a life, intensely, superbly real, at once humane and divine, heart answering to heart, love answering to love, divinity to new-born divinity, the Master to the disciple, who awakes from darkness into that marvellous light.

The death of the body is a benefit to humanity rather than a punishment, though it be thought of as the penalty of sin. We should call it rather the death of death than the death of the body. For our real body is not this fleshy lump of corruption. Rightly do the wise call our present bodies the prison and death of life. And when the life principle is liberated from this prison and living death, it is death that dies.

JOHN SCOTUS ERIGENA in *De Divisione Naturæ.*

When it is said, "Death and life are from the Lord," I do not think the writer speaks of that death which humanity dies through sin but of the death to which the Psalmist refers when he says, "Blessed in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints." The death of the saints is their passage to an intimate contemplation of truth, in which true happiness consists. This is the death which religious persons die, even while they remain dwelling in this life.

JOHN SCOTUS ERIGENA in *De Divisione Naturæ.*

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

THE EASTERN CHURCH

I

The Council of Nicæa

IN an endeavor to get an adequate and comprehensive view of the Eastern Church one is appalled by the vastness of the panorama. The field is so wide, both geographically and chronologically, that the mind's eye refuses to include it in the angle of vision, but turns from point to point, selecting first one, then another crisis as the centre of interest around which to group and arrange minor events. Afterward one can relate these separate pictures, each in itself so rich in dramatic quality and picturesque detail, into one harmonious whole, just as one grasps the unifying plan in a series of mural decorations, the component parts of which have first been studied and understood.

The Council of Nicæa is undoubtedly the culminating event of the early church, of the time not only before the West had divided from the East, but even before the so-called national churches of the East had adopted distinctive color and form. Backward from it, after traversing the dark and troubled period of the second and third centuries, we emerge into the light and simplicity of the Apostolic Age. Ahead stretches the long series of the later Councils, the points of departure for sect after sect, each with its defiant claim that it alone held to the original true faith; till in the modern world, Russia, holding in its inherent vigor the promise of the future, rivets the entire attention.

If, in this first paper, we can get a fair idea of the first great general gathering of the church (a gathering in which we can one and all feel an unquestioned hereditary right of standing room), and of the various elements which then flowed together and mingled into one whole, we shall be better prepared to understand the later segregations, to forgive many seeming trivialities which sunder modern Christendom.

Before the Nicene Council, the Church, as such, did not exist. There were churches, there were groups of Christian believers scattered widely over the East; there were a few centres already established in the West, but there was no common acknowledged authority, no recognized body of doctrine. Each individual bishop or leader was free to interpret the teaching according to his own conscience, his own will or fancy. Scarcely three hundred years had passed since the message of the Gospel had been given to the world, yet already various and varied peoples had seized upon their special portions of the gold of its truth, and having stamped it as their own coin were burning to foist it on the world as the only legal tender.

The province of Egypt was an especial storm centre, for there the fiercest of the battles, that of the famous Arian controversy, was being

furiously waged. When we consider the attenuated abstruseness of the question involved, a question which concerned, not the dealings of the Deity with man, not the divinity or the humanity of Christ, not the doctrine of the Trinity,—for all these points were acknowledged by both parties,—but the relation of the God-head before the Incarnation, before time, before the first beginnings of time: we are lost in amazement that the passions of men could have been so roused. For explanation we may perhaps look through the mere words and descry the living figure of Arius himself in the background, capturing imagination and sympathy by the rigid asceticism of his life, by the sweetness and power of his voice, by his throbbing earnestness or wild frenzy when roused from his habitual silence to the defense or promulgation of his tenets. Not only were the learned divines and school men ranged up for and against his standard, but likewise peasant and artisan. It was said of the City of Alexandria "Every corner, every alley, was full of these discussions. Ask a man 'How many oboli?' he answers by dogmatizing on generated and ungenerated being. Inquire the price of bread and you are told 'The Son is subordinate to the Father.' Ask if the bath is ready and the reply is 'The Son arose out of nothing.'"

Into this battlefield of dogma emerged the Emperor Constantine, fresh from the miracle of his recent conversion, full of high hope and the exalted expectation of uniting the world under one banner. The theological bickerings, the hitherto undreamed of polemics, over which he was forthwith called upon to arbitrate, may well have seemed to the powerful, unlettered man of action, but the flimsiest trivialities. In a letter to the Alexandrian Church he expresses his grievous disappointment that his newly adopted faith should be thus violently rent asunder. He tells of the hope with which he had turned from the distracted West to the Eastern regions of his Empire as those from which divine light had first sprung, and begging the combatants to abandon their disputes and return to the harmony befitting their common faith he writes: "What wound has fallen on my ears, nay, rather on my heart! Give me back my calm days and my quiet nights, light and cheerfulness, instead of tears and groans." But even with the Emperor of the world behind it the letter was in vain, the controversy had become too intense, had gone too far. Some other method had to be sought by which to bring about the ardently desired unanimity. According to his own declaration it was through direct, divine guidance that he conceived the idea of a great council of the entire church. Certain it is that it came to him "out of the blue," for the precedent of the Buddhist Councils, the only general religious assemblies which had heretofore been known to the world, was far outside the realm of his actual knowledge, and he thus embarked upon his project with all the zeal of an inspired genius. He would summon all these contending factions, so that together they could, —and should!—work out their own salvation. He himself would royally pay their travelling expenses, would act as host and preside at their

meetings, and while permitting perfect freedom of discussion would by the majesty of his power keep them well within bounds. Complimentary letters were addressed to the Bishops of all the churches. The second capital of Bithynia, Nicæa, the "City of Victory," was designated as the locality, a place accessible to all, yet far from the centre of dispute. The year 325 was named as the date that it might commemorate the twentieth year of his reign. "They came," says Eusebius, "as fast as they could run, in almost a frenzy of excitement and enthusiasm,"—a vast horde, for each Bishop was entitled to two presbyters and three slaves as his retinue. The church has accepted and woven into custom and legend three hundred and eighteen as the actual number of recognized delegates; but more important and more significant than mere numbers was the variety of character and type.

"There were present the learned and the illiterate, courtiers and peasant, aged bishops on the verge of the grave, beardless deacons just entering on their office; and it was an assembly in which the difference between age and youth held real significance. The new generation could just remember the joy of the Christian community at the edict of toleration published in their boyhood, but they themselves had suffered nothing. Not so the older and by far the larger part of the assembly. They had lived through the last and worst of the persecutions, and they now came like a regiment out of some frightful siege or battle, decimated and mutilated by the tortures or the hardships they had undergone. Most of the older members must have lost a friend or a brother. Many bore the peculiarly cruel marks of the last persecution, the loss of a right eye, or the searing of the leg-sinews to prevent escape from working in the mines. Both at the time and afterward, it was on their character as an army of confessors and martyrs, quite as much as on their character as an œcumenical council, that their authority reposed. In this respect no other council could approach them, and in the whole proceedings of the Assembly the voice of an old confessor was received almost as an oracle."

Nevertheless, it was the group of distinguished theologians who dominated the discussion, who threshed out the issues to their ultimate conclusions; and if we consider for a moment the masterly intellects and the towering personalities who crossed their keen intellectual swords, we shall wonder less at the sharpness of the conflict, shall more clearly discern the stamp they have set on all Christian thought.

The rock upon which the waves of controversy pounded most incessantly was undoubtedly the unyielding Arius himself; above the tumult and clamor of the contending factions his voice would rise ever and anon, chanting forth his vague abstractions to the tune of some dance melody—a method of popularization which strongly prefigures the modern revivalists, and which then as now so scandalized staid orthodoxy that it was forced to clap hands over ears for self-protection. Supporting him with the gifts of his learning and eloquence was Eusebius of

Nicomedia, through whom, chief advocate of the great heresy, the Emperor was destined on his death-bed to be finally received into the Church. An uncompromising Arian, likewise, was Theophilus, the strange fair-haired representative of the far north. Through him and his disciple Ulphilas, the "Moses of the Goths," the Teutonic nations received their version of the scriptures, and the barbarian hordes which were soon to overrun the Roman Empire, were semi-Christianized. Ranged up in the opposition party were such men of weight as the scholarly Eustathius of Antioch, together with his chief suffragan Eusebius of Cæsarea, the Father of Church History; the position of the latter as chaplain, confessor and interpreter to Constantine, secured him an influence in the Council only equalled by that of the "Magician of Spain," Hosius of Cordova, his special spiritual director in the Western Empire. Later, in the darkest and most mysterious crisis of Constantine's life it was probably Hosius who secured for the Latin Church the gift of the Lateran Palaces, the foundation of temporal power. Undoubtedly at this time he was of far greater moment in the eyes of the theological world than the aged Sylvester, Bishop of Rome, who, kept away by age and infirmities, was represented by two presbyters; of them we hear little during the proceedings of the Council, but their unquestioning subscription to its decrees is witnessed by their affixed signatures and declaration "We have subscribed for our Bishop who is Bishop of Rome. So he believes as above is written." The title of Pope belonged alone to the venerable Bishop of Alexandria, the titular head of the most important and learned group of the Assembly. But easily dominating them, and eventually sweeping the entire Council before him by his vivid personality, his versatility, and overmastering logic, was the youthful Egyptian, the Arch-Deacon Athanasius. Gregory describes him as "awakening the sluggish, repressing enthusiasm; equally alert in prevention and cure; single in his aims, manifold in his modes of government; wise in his speech, still wiser in his intentions; on a level with the most ordinary men, yet rising to the height of the most speculative; uniting in himself the various attributes of all the heathen gods." His subsequent life, closely coupled with the world's history from the reign of Constantine to that of Valentinian, a tragic series of exiles and elevations, of pomp and penury, of palace and hermitage, is summed up in a splendid tribute by Bishop Hooker,—"Such was the evil stream of those times that all men gave place unto it. Only of Athanasius there was nothing observed through that long tragedy than such as very well became a wise man to do and a righteous to suffer. So that this was the plain condition; the whole world against Athanasius, and Athanasius against the world. Half a hundred years spent in doubtful trial, which of the two in the end would prevail; the side which had all, or else the part which had no friend but God and death; the one a defender of his innocency, the other a finisher of his troubles."

An amazing contrast to all of these polished logicians must have been

the motley rank and file of the Assembly; desert dwellers from the interior of Egypt, their very names taken from the heathen Gods of the ancient Pharaohs; wild ascetics from the remoter East; sightless and limping confessors who had suffered under persecution; hermits from the mountains who subsisted by browsing on roots and leaves like wild beasts, and like them came clothed in rough goat-hair cloaks. There were simple godly men to whose sainthood we still bow, such as Spyridian, the Shepherd, now the patron of Corfu, and the good St. Nicholas himself, type of benevolence to children, to sailors, to the victims of thieves,—even to the thieves themselves! who held their faith sincerely but without much conscious knowledge. Incapable of entering into the subtle arguments of the schoolmen, the voice of some one of them occasionally pierces through the maze of dialectics with the clear note of direct experience. We can fancy how the wrangling over the vexed question of the homoousian versus the homoiousion must have dwindled into palpable absurdity, as an old confessor, bearing witness by his empty eye-socket and his paralyzed hands to his zeal for the Faith, painfully limped his way to the centre of the disputants and abruptly broke forth with an appeal beginning "Christ and the Apostles left us not a system of logic nor a vain deceit, but a naked truth to be guarded by faith and good works." We have testimony as to the compelling force of this utterance from one of the heathen philosophers, who, for sheer love of debate, was adding his quota to the dispute. When the exhortation ceased as abruptly as it had begun, he turned to the listeners and addressed them: "Hear, my learned friends! So long as it was a matter of words, I opposed words to words, and whatever was spoken I overthrew by my skill in speaking; but when in place of words, power came out of the speaker's mouth, words could no longer resist power, man could no longer resist. If any of you feel as I have felt, let him believe in Christ and follow this old man in whom God has spoken."

Another moment when the controversial air must have been summarily cleared was when, shortly after the formal opening of the Council, Constantine produced from the folds of his imperial mantle the countless papyrus rolls containing charges and counter-charges of personal and doctrinal enmities, and caused them to be burned, unread, their seals unbroken.

Yet in spite both of the weariness and impatience of the earnest contingent of the unlearned, and the eager effort of the Emperor himself to enforce unanimity, the discussion dragged itself interminably along,—a discussion so involved, so hair-splitting, that it fairly defies translation from the original Greek into any language lacking its subtle philosophical demarcations.

It was with small idea of being converted to the contrary opinion that the chief disputants were on the field; the final victory over the Arians and their condemnation as heretics, was the result not so much of overpersuasion as of overmastering numbers. That they were "con-

vinced against their will and of the same opinion still" is attested by the vital persistence of their dogma for the following three hundred years. Before long the pendulum of popular opinion swung back with such velocity that it was only the one-pointed might of Athanasius' will which prevented it from carrying all before it,—and this in spite of the unanimous enforced subscription to the orthodox decrees of the Council, in spite of the sweeping anathemas hurled against them as heretics, in spite of the summary burning of their books, and the death penalty which was pronounced against all who should dare peruse them.

Hydra-headed, it arose again and again to new life, in Italy and in Africa; among the Goths and the Lombards; in the Kingdoms of Spain and Southern France, until its final complete and bloody extermination by the sword of Clovis. Traces of the old fortifications against it persist in the structure of our modern church service, both in the constant repetition of the orthodox formula of the Gloria Patri at the close of every psalm and in the recitation of the Nicene Creed before the administration of the Eucharist.

It is to the everlasting honour of the Council that the heretics themselves were dealt with most gently; some deprivations of clerical honours, some curtailment of their authority, a few temporary banishments, were the extremes of their chastisement. This clemency stands forth in high relief when compared with the severity of later Councils; to the breadth and genial temper of the Emperor we may offer our gratitude that no such dark blot as the savage treatment of Nestorius at Ephesus, or of Huss at Constance stains the record of this first and greatest of the church gatherings. His bluff advice to an uncompromising bigot, "Ho! ho! Acesius! plant a ladder and climb up into heaven by yourself," is indicative enough of his attitude toward intolerance, even if we lacked the more explicit sentences of his farewell speech. "Let them avoid their party strifes; let them envy no one distinguished for wisdom, but regard the merit of every single individual as common property. God only could judge who were superior. Perfection was rare, so allowance must be made for the weaker brethren, slight matters forgiven, human infirmities allowed for, concord prized above all else, since factions only caused the enemies of faith to blaspheme. In all ways unbelievers must be saved; let them be like physicians, and accommodate the medicine to the disease, the teaching to the different minds of all." It is to be wondered if in all the intervening centuries we have progressed far beyond the gentle common-sense of these admonitions. He, in turn, as he was re-girt with the sword which he had relinquished when he first entered the Council chamber, was admonished to "openly defend the Faith," and moved by heartfelt thanksgiving at the happy culmination of his cherished project he bade them one and all to a solemn feast of joy. The swords of the Imperial Guard, so often bared against them in torture and in execution, were now unsheathed in their honour. The Emperor, himself, seated with a favored few at a table in their midst,

presided, and calling to him in turn bishop after bishop, loaded each with gifts and friendly words. It is small wonder that Eusebius describes the scene as "akin to the fancy of a dream, rather than a waking reality,—the likeness of the kingdom of Christ."

The hostile, negative labors of the Synod, which included the quashing of one or two minor schisms, together with the greater one which we have considered, have long since lost any save a remote historic interest; not so their positive affirmative accomplishment.

When Hosius presented to them their creed, a creed brought in substance direct from the plains of Sharon by Eusebius, he presented it practically unchanged to all modern Christendom. The work of the Chronologer Eusebius in adapting the cycle of the lunar year to the Paschal question, together with Alexandria's contribution of Egyptian astronomical lore, that the dates of subsequent Easters might be calculated with precision, are still our inalienable possessions, witnessed by the table of the Golden Number in every prayer-book. Even the forty volumes of the apochryphal canons have been translated into Arabic and are received by the Eastern Church as binding with the validity of imperial laws, while the authentic canons, only twenty in number, crop out unexpectedly in usage and custom, both East and West. Two minor points hold for us an exaggerated significance because of future developments. The one is a mere clause in the canon confirming to the Pope of Alexandria certain ancient privileges over the bishops in his province. It reads: "as in the parallel case of the Bishop of Rome," and was the slight ground on which at Chalcedon the See of Rome based its claim of precedence over the See of Constantinople! The other, not even incorporated into a canon, is the sharp defense by Paphnutius of a married clergy against the celibacy advocated by Hosius, a passage of arms presaging the chief outer differentiation between the two main branches of the Church.

In a later paper, we shall see how such small contentions widened into gulfs, how molehills of jealousy rose into mountains of envy, how desperately the different races clung to their characteristic psychological interpretations of the tenets. But for the moment we may leave them, happy in the delusion that the final stage in the church's history had begun; believing with Athanasius that the "word of the Lord which was given in the Council of Nicæa remaineth forever." In imagination we may join in the sigh of relief with which the inhabitants of the little Bithynian city must have watched the departure of the fiery prelates, as they wound their way up the steep wooded slopes of the surrounding mountains, or embarked upon the Ascanian Lake; and may rejoice in the calm which did indeed descend for a small space of years, not only upon Nicæa itself, but in some measure over the entire Christian world.

ANNE EVANS.

(*To be continued*)

LETTERS TO FRIENDS

VIII

DEAR FRIEND:

THE trouble is simpler than you think. You are not honest. I know very well how indignantly you will deny this,—when you first read it,—and how hurt and resentful you will feel that I, of all people, should dare to say it of you. Bear with me while I try to make it clear. For you must realize I am not speaking of the cruder forms of dishonesty,—insinuating that an open letter is not safe in a room alone with you, or that what you tell me is not so. Could you imagine yourself needing a recommendation, you know that the stereotyped formula of "honest, sober, and industrious" would be unqualifiedly endorsed. In that sense, honesty is perhaps the cheapest and most common of virtues. But in the deeper sense it is, I think, one of the rarest and most potent. What I want you to see is that, in this deeper sense, and in the things which count most in life, you are not, and have not been honest with yourself. You do not front life as it is, nor have you stripped aside the veils that cover you from your own eyes.

What are these veils? They take a thousand forms and colors. But I think they are chiefly woven from vanity and fear and the lust for pleasure, upon a background of dead inertia. Perhaps it were nearer the truth to speak of them as veils of light, dazzling rather than blinding us, always shifting, now from this side now from that, changing focus and color and angle, never long enough the same to enable us to see without pain and effort the true nature of that over which they play. But with pain and effort we can see, and it is of the utmost moment to us that we should. Use what simile suggests itself, the fact remains that so long as we do not see life as it is, we are like blind men, following à path we do not know and beset on every side with quicksands. Or, as our blindness is so largely of our own making and continuing, it is as if, upon a mountain road along the edge of precipices, we were to bandage our eyes, fearing to face the dangers of a path we still pursue. It is true that when we have found a guide, who will take our hand in his and lead us, we might in this way cross in blindness places where we would not venture could we see. But until we have found our guide blindness is little short of suicide.

Therefore I beg of you to make this effort; to penetrate beneath all the shifting appearance of things to see them as they are; to front your life, your self, your own heart and purposes and desires in simple unsparing honesty. It is a painful process, and one requiring no small courage. But it marks the beginning of true life.

And now perhaps, you are even more indignant with me than before, and think I have still more misread you. You do not believe that you have been dishonest with yourself. Still less do you believe that you are blind to the facts of your own life, or under any glamorous delusions regarding life in general. But bear with me still a little longer.

What is your life? What is it which you do actually and truly desire? Do not, at first, ask yourself what you ought to answer. Ask yourself what are the simple facts. Ever since you waked this morning you have been acting, thinking, feeling, desiring. What motives for your actions were you conscious of or can you now recall? What were the nature and the colour of your thoughts and feelings? What have been your actual desires? Take paper and pencil and write down the answers to these questions,—as fully, as directly, and as honestly as you can. Remember it is not to be shown to anyone. It is not to please your vanity. It is a simple test of your courage to face facts, of your ability to see actualities and to record them honestly as they were. Do this, for my sake and for truth's sake, before you read further.

* * * * * * *

And now what is it that your list contains? If you have really passed this first test of simple honesty, it will be a curious jumble that confronts you. At first glance the most obvious thing about it is its lack of apparent significance, the multiplicity of trivialities of thought and feeling, the long gaps in what you are able to recall of your conscious processes, the many intervals in which you appear to have been acting without other purpose than the mechanical obedience to habit,—your body or mind occupied, but your will and feeling suspended. Did you remember the thoughts which floated through your mind while dressing? Have you compared that for which you prayed with your feelings and actions at the breakfast table? Did you note how mechanically you provided for your bodily comfort, and chose a chair you liked, before beginning to read this letter? Have you traced this same love of comfort, and habitual search for it, throughout the other actions of the day? Have you recorded how often your mind said to you "I wish" thus or so, and seen the motives which made you thus "wish" things different from what they are,—idle wishes, vain wishes, discouraged, querulous wishes, which never give birth to action? Have you had the courage to put down the evil colouring of some of your idle day dreaming,—the thoughts that had entrance to your mind in odd moments of leisure? Have you found vanity, over sensitiveness, resentment of criticism, the wish to prove yourself right and others wrong? Have you seen anxiety, and fear and mean little subterfuges which you would have wished to have explained away had they been seen by others? Have you probed your attitude toward the daily round of your duties, and seen what proportion of them were fulfilled with the conscious purpose of doing them as perfectly as possible, and what proportion were done mechan-

ically or to get them over and out of the way that you might turn to something else? Have you noted what that "something else" was to which you wished to turn? And have you compared the amount of time in which you can say that your conscious purpose was love or service or in any way what you would wish it to be, with the amount of time in which you were conscious of no purpose at all, or in which, as you now look back upon it, you can see that your motives were concerned with self and were anything but what you wish?

If you have done these things you have begun to be honest. But I think now you will grant me that the view they give you of your daily life is not one which you have heretofore kept clearly before you as you have thought about yourself. You have rarely been honest with yourself in just this way before, though often enough you have been filled with self-disgust. But self-disgust is not honesty. We have as yet only part of the picture before us, and a half truth may be the worst of lies.

You have tried to record your conscious life as you live it hour by hour. Try now to record your ideal,—what you wish to be; yes, and what you wish to have or do,—trying in this also to be wholly direct and honest. Courage, strength, effectiveness, indomitable cheerfulness, the self-giving love which enables us to live in a larger life than that of the personality,—all these I know you will put down and many others. But put down also what you think you would wish to have and to do. Wealth, if you desire wealth. Pleasure, in whatever form you desire it, even though that form seem anything but ideal. If you do actually desire it, it is part of your present ideal. Put it down, that you may deal with it honestly. And when you have made this list as best you can, and have before you a picture of what you would like to be, and the way in which you would like to act, and what you would like to have, take up again the first record you made of the day as you actually lived it.

Compare the two, point by point. Take circumstances just as they were, your duties just as they were. And ask yourself of each circumstance or duty, of each hour of your day, what opportunity it offered for the expression or the gaining of the qualities and possessions your ideal list contains. You will find that nowhere was there any barrier to the qualities of being. No circumstance can prevent our being courageous, cheerful, loving, unselfish,—though we are forever blaming circumstances for our failures. We say to ourselves that it is hard, just when we have made up our mind to be kind and loving, to be met with such intolerable crossness or unjust accusation, and that no one could be sweet tempered with so and so. But in so saying we are simply blinding ourselves to the truth. We want to be courageous but think it impossible because there is danger, we would be sweet-tempered, but cannot bear to be provoked. These are but the lying excuses of cowardice and weakness. Our desire failed, not the opportunity.

But if we could remember our desire, we see clearly enough that there is not a moment of the day when we cannot be exercising our-

selves in some one of the qualities which we wish to gain. Here there is no barrier to the fulfilment of desire.

With what we wish to have and do it is different. Here we see a thousand barriers,—barriers in circumstances, barriers in our duties, above all, barriers in those very qualities of being which we wish to acquire and to be. Here our list is self-contradictory. Duty and pleasure lead in opposite ways. We have to choose between the things which we would have and the things which we would be. How are we to make that choice?

You have seen how you make it unconsciously hour by hour. Or rather how you fail to make it, as you pursue first one and then the other, forever compromising, forever oscillating, forever losing both, by vacillating indecision and blind forgetfulness of purpose. But how should you make it? The answer is obvious enough. By honestly examining the two between which you have to choose.

There is no mystery in the matter, save that which our own dishonesty may create. We stand as it were with a seed in either hand, and ask ourselves which one we shall plant to grow up as our later life. In the one hand is the seed of the search for pleasure, in the other the seed of the search for being. Whichever we plant will grow according to its kind. Their life history is known to us. This pet sin or pleasure which seems to us now so attractive will lead us where it has led those who followed it before us. We can predict its course, and our own under its shadow, quite accurately. Only as we blind our eyes need we fail to see what it will cause us to become.

If, therefore, we are to front life as it is, we have also to front these facts. Of the paths desire seeks to follow many are mutually incompatible, and of these many, there are few which we would wish to follow to the end. It is only at their beginnings that they seem attractive. And from where we stand we can see far beyond their beginnings. Only by deliberately shutting our eyes, by refusing to recognize what we have seen, can we say we desire to follow them.

Go back, therefore, again over your lists. Trace out in this way the life history of each of the motives you have recorded, of each of the desires you have found swayed your conduct, or which you have included in the list of your present ideals. Strike out those which you would not follow to the end. For it is simple foolishness to think that you can stop midway. As well say that you will drink laudanum because you like its taste, but will stop short of experiencing its soporific effect.

And now, after this long self-examination, and painful probing, what have you gained? Some understanding, perhaps, of what I meant when I said the trouble was that you were not honest. But such an end as that is of small consequence. What I hope that you have gained is this. First, a clear view of the drifting, purposeless, self-contradictory and dishonest character of the greater portion of our personal lives. Second, a clearer vision of what you actually do desire in the true and

honest soul of you,—a stripping away, as mere glamorous delusions, of many things you have often thought you desired. And third, as the result of these two, a perception of the directions in which your will must act in order to change your life from that which you have lived to that which you wish to live.

I will confess one further hope,—if you will read over again what has remained in your list of your ideals. The hope is this: that you would see that, despite all you have said to the contrary, your actual and permanent desires are precisely those which motived all the saints,—that the qualities you wish for yourself found their perfect expression and perfect life in the life of the Master,—and that your love of them and desire for them, when synthesized, must mean love of Him and desire for Him.

The truth is that the saints were the only really honest people,—the only ones who had the courage to be wholly and entirely honest. I do not think any one can read their autobiographies without being profoundly impressed by an integrity of which the world offers no other examples. They faced all things as they were and dared to face themselves. And thus they became saints. For I do not believe any man can be wholly honest and not become either saint or devil. But if, as I think we must, we rule the devils out, the saints alone are left. There is no other destiny to which we can honestly aspire.

"Humility and Love." In these words St. Teresa summed the whole of human knowledge and human achievement. For the first means knowledge of self, and the second knowledge of God. May your long suffering forbearance with your friend help you upon the Path which leads to them.

Faithfully yours,

JOHN GERARD.

Nobody has a right to find life uninteresting or unrewarding who sees within the sphere of his own activity a wrong he can help to remedy, or within himself an evil he can hope to overcome.

CHARLES H. ELIOT.

BERGSON'S PHILOSOPHICAL POSITION

I

"THOU has made us for Thyself, O Lord; and our heart is restless until it rests in Thee." St. Augustine here expresses in religious terms what the mind of man has always intuitively known, and what the heart of man has always ultimately felt. The mind knows that it desires certainty, truth; the heart feels an ever recurring sense of incompleteness, a vague dissatisfaction with even the best that the world can give. In history we see that man has used every faculty he possesses to satisfy this call of the Soul. The dances of primitive savages, the magic, true and false, of Hermetic and related schools, the work of science in the exploration of nature, all the religions, sects, and philosophies ever recorded, are simply manifold examples of his endeavor to satisfy this craving. The achievement of civilizations has been to contribute some new understanding, some further impulse towards a solution of the problem of the human consciousness. Looked at in this light, a retrospect of the origin and advancement of modern science in all its branches affords a panorama of marvellous interest; showing a slow but sure development, as if under a guiding hand, towards those planes of life which approach more nearly the deeps of our nature; and by this tendency giving glimpses into the possibilities of a rich harvest to come, even in such an age of transition and scattering of forces as is this.

The yearning for truth may be said to have expressed itself in two strongly marked types of men: the directly religious and mystical, who, in whatever language or by whatever method, have sought to minimize the world and reach up to God and the heavenly kingdom as the one goal worth attaining, the one absolute reality; and those whose spiritual faculties seem to be less consciously active, but who nevertheless stretch every nerve, impose rigorous self-discipline, and satisfy this impulse urging them onward by turning their energy to the study of matter or to the unravelling of the enigma of human intellect and psychology. Philosophy, and especially so-called modern philosophy, is the summation of this latter type; and in view of the new awakening, which is taking place in philosophy, as in religion and the churches, it becomes a field of critical interest, and one which might easily lead the scientific world in the direction of the deeper and more spiritual wisdom which up to now the materialism of science has rejected or omitted from its consideration.

To every man, under whatever head he may be classed, has been

accorded a vision; the scientist sees it in an explanation of nature's phenomena, the musician in some harmony, the artist in beauty, the mystic in the spiritual world, in the Master. And man has always felt, and felt truly, that a complete knowledge of his specialty would ultimately lead him to Truth and Knowledge, however vaguely apprehended at the start. But of all these seekers, none have been able to assure the world of the finality of their quest, of the success of *their* method, except the mystics, whose unbroken testimony is so universally disregarded and laughed at, alike by science, philosophy, and the world at large. It is with peculiar hopefulness, therefore, that we watch the leaders of modern scientific and philosophic thought, through their very unswerving loyalty to truth, laying the foundations for, and leading themselves and each other nearer and nearer to, the place where the testimony of the saints and the spiritual teachings of the world's great religious leaders will alone provide the key for progress.

Especially does this seem to be true of the philosophy expounded by Henri Bergson, of the speculations of Sir Oliver Lodge, and also to a certain degree of the theories of Rudolph Euken. These men are the pioneers of the day, each in his respective field. Throughout the history of philosophy there has always been a marked discrepancy between pure theory and innate belief. Conflicting theorists have been forced to stamp belief as either a mental vagary, illusory and without logical substantiation, or as the very foundation of philosophy itself. Theory has been developed into a science of critical speculation, and has been treated by the one school as a form of knowledge;—belief, for the average man, is a form of knowledge, and always has been. The task presenting itself to every intelligence is how to coördinate the perception of the world as received through the senses with those certain convictions about itself and the universe which elude all mental analysis and verification. Bergson, standing strictly and safely on the results of up-to-date biology and psychology, is pushing his conclusions through the traditional planes of reasoning and intellect to those of will and soul. In Eastern terminology, he is interpreting Higher Manas, the plane of sure conviction, certain intuition, and creative will; a plane which is also the medium of and closely linked with, the purely spiritual Buddhi. Furthermore Bergson is urging as the highest duty and function of man the cultivation of these faculties ordinarily so cramped and stultified in our material personalities. Euken, standing less surely on the sciences of the day, is developing beside Bergson's philosophy a Philosophy of the Spirit, of man's relation to the Real. Both men are leading away from the philosophic materialism of the past century; Euken by an original and somewhat idealistic leap into the philosophically unexplored, Bergson by the erection of a solid superstructure on the philosophically accredited deductions of his predecessors. It can be seen how much greater will be the influence of this latter method on the philosophic world because of the thorough foundations upon which it is built.

Rightly to understand and appreciate Bergson's position in the history of philosophy and in the sequence of this approach to the Real which is guided, as it seems, by an all-wise and prophetic wisdom, an outline of the great movements of philosophic thought will be attempted, followed by an effort to analyze just what Bergson has contributed, with the new direction and impetus that he may give to future philosophers.

II

So much of the thought of the earliest Greek philosophers has been completely misunderstood by the modern schools that it is difficult to get an accurate perspective of the heart of their doctrines. In recent numbers of the QUARTERLY, *Notes and Comments* have given some illuminating hints as to the inner interpretation of such better known men as Orpheus, Pythagoras, Plato, and Socrates, together with the suggestion that the foundation of their wisdom lay in at least partial initiation into the great Egyptian mysteries and esoteric teaching. This immediately separates Greek philosophy from the modern schools by the very fact that there is a heart to its theories, a symbolic language to be interpreted correctly. Philosophy since Descartes can boast of no such depth or understanding. Bergson has been accused by his critics of simply dressing up in new and attractive words the ideas of Heracleitus, who lived about 500 B. C. Heracleitus, with his sobriquet of the Obscure on account of his use of paradox, is little understood by recent idealists, realists, and utilitarians. Bergson openly acknowledges his debt to Heracleitus; but more especially to Plotinus, who lived from about 204 to 270 A. D. We find in these sources from which Bergson drew his inspiration, the division which now exists between himself and the modern philosophic positions. Heracleitus taught of an Energizing Fire, "the symbol for a free and life-giving Spirit of Becoming," the purifier that initiates into a more spiritual growth. "All things are in a state of flux," he says. "Reality is a condition of unrest." "Everything happens through strife," and yet the purpose of all this struggle is a harmony. "Men say that things are right or wrong, but the gods see no good or evil, but all things to them are one sweet harmony." Further than this "the hidden harmony is better than the heard," and "all men desire to get at the permanent heart of changefulness." Unlike Plato, Heracleitus held that the mind is an instrument, an appendage of the whole man. This is a cardinal postulate of Bergson, and marks him at once as diverging from the traditional foundation on Plato and the Greek intellectual culturalists, who taught that the intellect was the organ of ultimate knowledge. Modern philosophy with its inability to interpret any of the mysteries of the ancients, values Heracleitus for his attempt at an idealism, but suspects him of being unduly influenced by the Persian Fire-Worship mysteries into which tradition says he was initiated. They do not esteem him half as highly as they do Thales, because way back in

600 B. C. this old "Wise Man" had a scientific turn and accurately predicted an eclipse of the sun—a truly modern achievement—or even Anaximander (540 B. C.), who conceived the world as cylindrical in shape, and as merely one of the heavenly bodies, with a life and evolution of its own similar to that of any animal. In other words, modern philosophy, being materialistic, understands only in its own terms the statements of the ancients, labelling as visionary the symbolic or mystical.

Greek philosophy may be summed very briefly as having two distinct phases;—one a purely logical and intellectual, the other in its early purity an inner conception and appreciation of the spiritual world. Modern philosophy inherits from the former. It would seem to be chiefly the degeneration of the inner religious life of Greece into the cultivation of the merely ethical and intellectual that, in the words of *Notes and Comments,* "forced the Western Avatar to fall back on the second line of preparation, which had been laid in Palestine through the aspiration and sacrifice of the Hebrew prophets." The heart of Greek philosophy was lost, had been squandered unworthily. "Greek culture fell to pieces," says the same writer; "in morals, corruption; in mental life, levity and purposeless, fruitless dissipation of energy; in political life, mean ambitions and servility. . . ." Therefore the Master Jesus, unable to establish his great spiritual life and teaching on the degenerate Greek tradition, chose rather for his foundation that of the intense and monotheistic Jews. In this new environment there were great possibilities, "there were also grave dangers: zeal became fanaticism; the narrow worship of the law was never far from materialism; national ideals merged into national bigotry."

In the reasons back of this choice of the Western Avatar we see that the ideal of Greek philosophy had been lowered, had undergone a change. From being a vesture for spiritual truth, it had descended to the level of barren mental gymnastic and culture. By this misuse of spiritual force, it lost the ability to see the truth offered to it, ceased to be the language of initiates, of the wise, and became the instrument for speculation in the intellectual realms and for a critical examination of the mere forms of knowledge. The history of philosophy, as the term is now used, becomes the study of the growth of these speculations, themselves parallel with the accumulated growth of the world's scientific experience. In Plato's words, the philosopher is one who has only "magnificence of mind."

It is important that the ancient achievement of the Greeks in having an inner significance to their philosophy be remembered, because we now trace its development through many phases of materialistic expression until it becomes entirely lost to philosophy; and whatever of esoteric truth existed at one time in philosophy now becomes transferred to a separate field—the strictly orthodox religions. Gradually, however, materialism itself has expanded with the increased civilization of the

world, until to-day science and philosophy alike are searching for forces and causes that spring from a religious, a spiritual life, and not from the world of matter. With Bergson we seem to see an interpreter of the newly awakened consciousness; one who is turning again towards the light, is endeavoring directly to reach the planes of enlightenment formerly the true heritage of the philosopher.

III

Two main streams of thought emerged during the first few centuries after Christ; now labelled respectively Christian Supernaturalism and Neoplatonism. It has been said that after the weaknesses of the Hebraic environment had led to the rapid decline of the early church from its original standard set chiefly by St. Paul, an effort was made, by infusing into Christian thought the best of the Greek element still remaining, to strengthen and broaden the outlook of the church, and so not to lose entirely the mysticism which existed amongst the Greek initiates. The Neoplatonic system contributed largely to this end, though an admixture of all types of thought was practically inevitable in so cosmopolitan a world as the Roman Empire. Even the earliest liturgic fragments which we possess, and such primitive religious poetry as the "Odes of Solomon" and the "Hymn of Jesus" show how sympathetically the early church absorbed and transmuted the mystic element of Orphic, Essene, and, later, Neoplatonic thought. St. Clement of Alexandria (A. D. 160-220) first adapted, in a literary form, the language of the pagan mysteries to the Christian theory of spiritual life. Following him the next great figure was Plotinus, whose influence on St. Augustine (354-430) and on Dionysius the Areopagite (475-525?), and therefore indirectly on the whole church, can hardly be over-estimated. Since Bergson credits Plotinus with being the source of much of his own inspiration, it will be worth while to discuss this too little known yet important factor in our sequence of thought.

Born in Alexandria about 204, Plotinus studied in the best schools there, and later went to Rome where he lectured on philosophy for many years. Some time before his death in 270 he retired to Campania with his disciples, the most distinguished of whom was Porphyry. Plotinus was the first great systematizer of the Neoplatonic school. Intellectually his starting point was that of an idealist, showing distinct elements of the Platonic influence, with adaptations of paganism and with infusions of the Oriental cults that ran riot in Alexandria in the third century. Ostensibly Plotinus was a metaphysician, with all a metaphysician's burning passion to know and realize the Absolute. This side of Plotinus is recognized and respected by modern philosophers; but in vain do they struggle with his self-contradictions and paradoxes. For Plotinus was also a mystic, almost in spite of his philosophic mind; and the endeavor to reconcile his preconceived system with the enlightenment received

in spiritual experiences led him to many flagrant inconsistencies. This very lack of perfect compactness and rigidity accomplished the purpose which, as suggested, was the effort at this time. Appearing at the moment when the wreck of paganism was complete, and before Christianity had dominated the educated world, Neoplatonism strongly attracted the spiritually minded—both Christian and pagan—and this just because it was a none too clearly formulated and semi-religious philosophy, into which much could be read, and back of which lay the compelling yet mysterious genius of Plotinus himself. The originality of his terminology was in itself an advantage, and pagan though he was, most later Christian mystics use his terms, notably St. Augustine and St. John of the Cross.

Plotinus emphatically asserted the existence of spirit, and the soul as deriving life and light direct from spirit. The true source of reality is the One, the Absolute, the Infinite. The One is not Being or Mind, but over-Being and over-Mind. Matter is darkness as compared with the One, which is light. Man, being body and soul, is partly spiritual and partly material—the perversion or reflection of the spiritual. This belief naturally led Plotinus to teach the illusory nature of all temporal things. What chiefly attracted the mystics was the further development of Plotinus along religious rather than philosophic lines, carefully expressed though it was in philosophical terms, and based on his cosmological conceptions and system. So long as the mystic teaching was drawn from a real experience of the soul, the disciple did not care whether Plotinus was consistent or inconsistent with this system; only the matter of fact mind is at a loss as to the proper classification and correlation of such a mixed presentation. That Plotinus did draw from personal experience is incontrovertible, as we have in the plainest language his own record that he attained three times in his life to ecstatic union with "the One." It is to these descriptions of ecstatic union with God, the "Unconditioned One" in another of his phrases, that the later Christian mystics turn for enlightenment, or for terms with which to express their own experiences.

Plotinus' method for attaining this state is clearly set forth in his works, and reveals the true position and greatness of the man himself. Since God reveals himself according to our capacity to receive him, it is our duty to return to God by eliminating any tendency towards the material. We must, therefore, "forsake wickedness, sensation, conceptions, and multiplicity;"—a very suggestive passage, in that Plotinus himself tacitly acknowledges that in his own mental and philosophic "conceptions" he found a barrier. To receive the One the soul must also become formless and empty through the path of contemplation. "He will not behold the Supreme whilst he is drawn downward by those things that are an obstacle to the vision; for he does not ascend alone, but brings with him that which separates him from the One: in a word he is not made one." The process of the ascent of the soul and of attainment to this formlessness is described in language borrowed from Plato's

Symposium. We are to rise from our physical beauties, which, since they come from the soul, necessarily imply an essentially ideal or beautiful soul. This physical beauty is a form which all bodies more or less share; therefore the ascent is from multiplicity of form in the body to unity of beauty in the Soul. If for the physical beauties of the body we read those qualities in our souls of which they are the outward expression, the "ideal" or Platonic symbology in this passage may be more easily penetrated. Plotinus delighted at times in obscurity, it being at that period the prerequisite for any philosophical writing. In describing attainment or union he is, however, more simple and direct. Having abstracted the soul from hindrances, we must learn to "energize enthusiastically" on another plane—a really spirited phrase, and in view of his constant insistence upon abstraction and negation, one worth noticing. "But when we do behold Him, then we obtain the end of our wishes, and rest. Then we are no longer discordant, but form a truly divine dance about Him; in the which dance the soul beholds the Fountain of life, the Fountain of intellect, the Principle of Being, the cause of good, the root of soul" (*Ennead,* vi. 9).

It is curious that the later Christian saints who studied Plotinus should have so easily overlooked the lack of orthodoxy in his teaching; but it certainly was due to this disregard on their part that the Greek and pagan elements in his thinking were absorbed into the Hebraic and strictly Christian types of belief. Plotinus' "One," used synonymously with his term "God" by him, is distinctly not a personal deity, but an abstract unity gained by abstracting all qualities;—a pure "form" of thought, that neither reasons nor thinks. If the One did think or reason, it would lapse into multiplicity, says Plotinus, and therefore cease to be absolute unity. Christian mystics completely overlooked the inconsistency of such statements with their own theistic or trinitarian belief;—blinded, perhaps, by the glamour of Plotinus' vivid descriptions of ecstatic union. Pantheism is the logical outcome of such a conception of purely abstract unity, because an abstract One must be everything or nothing. John Scotus Erigena, the "bright light" of the ninth century, was led astray by Plotinus, and on close analysis his theology was pronounced unorthodox by the Church, and he only escaped persecution through the protection of the Emperor—then an enemy of Rome. Similarly this conception of an abstract unity proved to be the source in Christian mystical writings for the negative abstract conception of Deity—a "blank unity of which nothing should be predicated." The duty of the contemplative was, not to concentrate his complex unity on the complex unity of God, but rather to abstract himself away into a blank "formless unity," corresponding to what he conceived to be the divine nature. On the attainment of union he received intuitions concerning this divine nature, which brought further enlightenment. The Quietest heresy developed out of these theories.

Philosophically, then, Plotinus insisted upon three fundamental prin-

ciples, which are recognized by modern philosophers as his special contribution. These are: (1) the inability of this world, however fully and scientifically conceived, to satisfy the human spirit; (2) the existence of a Divine nature beyond and above this world; and (3) the possibility of entering into communion with this Divine nature. These principles are equally fundamental to mysticism, and it is here that we may be able to trace the real depths of Bergson's insight. Plotinus, having worked out a brilliant intellectual philosophy, modified from Greek and other sources, is received and has his place in the modern estimation. And his theories according to the wont of recent schools are open to further analysis, development, or criticism *ad libitum*. But since Plotinus was also a mystic, with his own set of terms not specifically those of Christianity, he can be more safely used as a source, or as an authority, without incurring the danger of being stigmatized as "religious" and "unscientific." Bergson well knows that modern philosophy, while studying the Scholastic reasoning and ontology, does so under protest, and does not accept the Christian theology imposed by the religion of the schoolmen; and he may well wish, if his aim be consciously what it seems to be, to avoid being disregarded as a mere interpreter of outworn dogmas or of "mystical hallucinations." If this be the case, Bergson shows his wisdom both in laying secure foundations, and in not attempting to force the pace, so to speak, beyond the present insight and ability of his age. He is being a true teacher and leader; he is not "casting pearls before swine."

IV

During the Patristic period all that was best in Neoplatonism became absorbed into Christianity, and evolved what is called Christian Platonism. St. Augustine and Dionysius the Areopagite were imbued with its teaching, were students of the Plotinian school, and freely used their master's terminology. St. Augustine's influence on later times is too well known to need comment. Dionysius has lost in this generation the tremendous prestige that was his for more than a thousand years, and it is difficult for us to reconstruct with our false perspective the true importance of this mysterious writer. He was a thorough disciple of Plotinian mysticism, and his works were quoted and his authority appealed to by everybody. In this one man alone we see, then, how complete was the final intermingling of the Greek element with Christianity and its Hebraic setting.

After this period of assimilation and reconstruction, there set in one of inevitable crystallization, and the Church began the formulation of hard and fast dogma. In the works of Gregory the Great (540-604) we get the first orderly and systematic doctrine, later so peculiarly characteristic of Roman writings. St. Gregory was a religious man, and his work was intended more for the preservation of truth from the maelstrom of conflicting ideas than for the exclusion of heresy. For this

reason he was widely read by later contemplatives, and had a growing influence. But the age for intellectual tortuousness had again set in, and the minds of men were turned almost exclusively to hair-splitting discussions and trivial or futile argumentation. Theology grew to be the dominant consideration of the educated thinkers, and gradually the body of what is called Scholastic philosophy emerged. The Scholastics were intellectual giants, and the mysticism which undoubtedly lay at the bottom of their hearts was both obscured and stultified. So well known and illustrious an example as St. Thomas Aquinas (1226-1274) is rarely referred to for mystical testimony, whereas he is the authority on Scholastic theology and dogma;—and yet St. Thomas was a true mystic, as a sympathetic examination of his writings will prove. He performed the additional and invaluable task of reconciling the scientific philosophy of Aristotle, then attracting the most universal attention throughout Europe, with the orthodox Church dogma. Largely through his superior genius, "Philosophy was the Handmaid of Theology;" that is, it found its data and expression in Christian Theology, but was *not* an attempt to unify the two, nor an attempt to use philosophy to prove Christian Theology. Scholasticism, viewed as a philosophical system and taken in its most complete sense, was a broader, more human expression of the narrower philosophy of the Middle Ages, which had been so severely restricted by the barbarism and disorder that had been the prevailing history since the decline of the Roman Empire. It was a new type of thinking and being, with a strong religious coloring, and an almost complete dependence on authority. The Church was the one organization sufficiently powerful to maintain its integrity, but it did so at the cost of hardening itself within its own institutionalism. It learned to control man's soul; it attempted to direct and control his thinking. Christian thought became gradually more and more hemmed in by the canons of the Church, and, unable to escape the dogma encompassing it, endeavored to penetrate within this dogma, and eventually undermined it. The crest of the philosophic wave at this point left Scholasticism to the Church as its official philosophy, and passed over into the new field of experimental science, to what became strictly the commencement of the modern philosophical period. Looking back on Scholasticism, there was much that was modernistic, in that much of it was purely academic; and it is this phase of the system that alone receives the serious attention of later superiority and insight. All the theology or mysticism is labelled Christian Supernaturalism founded on a dogmatic Faith, and is carefully disregarded as such.

In concluding this outline sketch of the more remote philosophies, it is well to notice one point vital to our theme, and characteristic of, what we may term, all ancient systems. There existed *consciously* in the minds of one and all of the founders of these systems a realization of the spiritual world, of occultism, of mysticism. Not till the degeneration of philosophy, not till philosophers became aware of their *intellectual*

power and leadership over men and affairs, did this inner and spiritual core become dissipated, and the essential heart of philosophy become lost. Even Scholasticism retained, through its close association with the Christian religion, an understanding of true devotion and of the Way of Perfection. It is only in the period upon which we now enter that the mind of man gets the complete upper hand over his heart and intuitions, and so, looked at from one point of view, we have to deal with much that is worthless and sterile.

JOHN BLAKE, JR.

(*To be continued*)

The kingdom of heaven is not come, even when God's will is our law: it is come when God's will is our will. While God's will is our law we are but a kind of noble slaves; when His will is our will, we are free children.

GEORGE MACDONALD.

SHANKARACHARYA'S CATECHISM*

IV

THE CAUSAL BODY

Hearing, touch, sight, taste, smell: these are the five powers of perception.

Space is the divinity of hearing.
The great Breath is the divinity of touch.
The Sun is the divinity of sight.
The Lord of the waters is the divinity of taste.
The twin heavenly Horsemen are the divinities of smell.
These are the divinities of the powers of perception.
The object of hearing is the grasping of sounds.
The object of touch is the grasping of contacts.
The object of sight is the grasping of forms.
The object of taste is the grasping of tastes.
The object of smell is the grasping of odors.

HERE, in brief, is the outline of the physics of the Vedanta, and also a suggested clue to much of the symbolic religion of India, from the Rig Veda onward. Vedantin physics is closely related to metaphysics. Vedantin physics is deductive, not inductive like ours. It is the result of a "leading down" from above.

We shall gain insight into its essence if we recall what has been already said, as to the expression of the One Being in the three modes: consciousness, will, life. Then each of these three is conceived as further divided into five (or, from another point of view, seven) powers: five powers of perception, five powers of action, five vital powers.

We have an analogy in our own physics. The radiant power of the sun is conceived as divided into three great groups of rays: the light-bearing, the heat-bearing, and the actinic, which carry the power of chemical action, as, for example, in photography. The light-bearing rays are then divided into seven: violet, indigo, blue, green, yellow, orange, red. Doubtless an analogous division may exist in the heat-rays, which include the ultra-red, and the actinic rays, which include the ultra-violet. Sounds are also divided into seven, the seven notes of the musical scale.

To come back to the Vedanta: these fivefold or sevenfold powers are summed up in the Heavenly Man, who contains within himself the

* Copyright, 1913, by Charles Johnston.

Heavenly Host. Of Him, the universe is the divine incarnation; the earthly man is made in His image. Therefore, each of our powers has its corresponding divinity, its regent in the Heavenly Host. From one of these great Beings, each ray comes down, in its threefold nature: perceptive, active and vital power.

Or, to put the matter in another way: We should regard our physical powers as but the first sketch and forecast of spiritual powers, the destined powers of the spiritual man, who comes into being through the second birth, the birth from above.

Voice, hands, feet, the powers of reproduction and rejection: these are the five powers of action.

Of voice, the Fire-god is the divinity.
Of hands, the Ruler is the divinity.
Of feet, the Pervader is the divinity.
Of reproduction, the Creator is the divinity.
Of rejection, Death is the divinity.
These are the divinities of the powers of action.
The object of voice is speech.
The object of hands is the grasping of things.
The object of feet is going.
The object of rejection is the removal of waste.
The object of reproduction is creation.

This must be taken with what has been already said. After the perceptive, we consider the active side of the fivefold powers, each flowing from a divine power in the Heavenly Man.

It is significant that here, as on the day of Pentecost, the divine power of speech, the creative Word, is symbolized by the tongued flame of the Fire-god.

What is the causal body?

That which is formed through ineffable, beginningless unknowing; the cause and material of the two bodies; as to the proper nature of the Self, unknowing; taking form through differentiation: this is the causal body.

We have here the metaphysics and physics of the causal body set forth in a few enigmatic sentences, which, without some explanation, are almost unintelligible.

Before we consider them in detail, let us try to get a general understanding of the teaching.

Atma, the divine Consciousness, is eternally One; the oneness of Atma, the supreme Self of all beings, is, indeed, the cardinal doctrine of the Vedanta as set forth by Shankaracharya. On this ultimate oneness, our hope of salvation, of perfection as of the Father, finally rests. We

can become one with God, because, in the last analysis, we are one with God already. It is a question of coming to consciousness of our oneness.

Yet we are separate individuals, with separate perception and will; and of such separate persons, making up humanity, there are countless multitudes. There must, therefore, be a point at which the One, while remaining the One, becomes the many.

The best symbol is a diamond, cut in many facets, each of which is an entrance to the diamond, and to all of it; a door into the whole of its inner splendor. In some such way, Atma, the Eternal, the One, may be conceived as having a multitude of facets, as the one sun has a multitude of rays.

What are we to say of the boundary-line of each facet? Is it real or unreal? It is real, in that it is a part of the substance of the diamond. It is unreal, in that it has not, and cannot have, any existence of its own, apart from the diamond.

The power, which makes the facets on the diamond; or which, to drop this illuminating metaphor, makes for the separation of Atma into our separate selves, is called, in the Vedanta, avidya: "unknowing," since its essence is, to conceal from us the reality of our oneness with the Eternal, and therefore with each other. It is ineffable, indefinable by any individual mind, since it is the cause of that individual mind's separate individuality; and the mind, which is the effect, cannot go behind its own cause, to understand and define it.

Therefore, it is said that the causal body, which is the principle of separate individuality, is "formed through ineffable, beginningless unknowing."

It is also "the cause and material of the two bodies"; that is, of the finer body and the physical body, which have already been described.

Let us see what this means.

The causal body is the basis of individual existence, the driving power of individual evolution. This evolution is carried forward by a process of mirroring the qualities and powers of Atma, the Ineffable One, in the individual self; by externalizing these powers and qualities in the outer personality, so that, through using and contemplating them, there may come, first self-knowledge, and at last knowledge of the Self; first, self-realization, as the personal man, and at last, as the great consummation, Moksha, Nirvana, realization of one's life as Atma, the infinite Divine Eternal.

In the causal self is embodied and stored up, so to speak, the plan of this evolution, as well as the driving force to carry it forward. For this reason it bears the name "causal": it is the dwelling place of the causes of the evolutionary process, in some such sense as the tree is the cause of the leaves, which are put forth each year in spring, to fall each year, by a vital act of putting off, in autumn. The leaves come forth from the tree, which furnishes at once their driving power and their substance. The tree is the "cause and material" of leaves and flowers.

The causal body, then, puts forth the finer body, on the mould of which, through the intervention of the parental life-process, the material body is built. And, as the body grows, year by year, new powers are introduced into it from above and within, through the energy of the causal body, which is thus the ruler and unfolder of the individual Karma, adjusting each life to the needs of its evolution, and ordaining its setting in such a manner that the errors and aberrations, the excesses and deficiencies, of the preceding life, and of earlier lives, may be repaired.

We must now remind ourselves of what has already been said of the finer body: that it has two sharply contrasted states, before and after regeneration. It is, first, the psychical body, the body of dreams; it is reborn as the spiritual body, the body of the spiritual man.

In a far wider reach, the causal body has also two contrasted stages: the first is that which we have tried to outline, where it is the plan and driving-power of the psychical and physical bodies, directing the life of these toward the great event of regeneration. Then, when the life-tide turns back, through regeneration, and flows once more toward Atma, when

> that which flowed from out the boundless deep
> turns again home,

when the psychical body has become the spiritual body, and the fuller and more central consciousness dwells in the spiritual man, the time has come for the causal body also to undergo a change. Instead of being the unseen director behind the veil, sending forth the personal self as its ambassador, the causal body is now to become the home, the vesture, of the full individual life, illuminating the spiritual body from within, as this has already illuminated the natural body.

First the focus of individual consciousness was in the physical body. Then, through regeneration, it ascended to the psychical body, transforming it into the spiritual body. The process is to continue, and the focus of consciousness will rise to the causal body, the individual becoming thereby a Master, an adept. As Master, he dwells, as it were, in the midst of the divine, creative forces that have hitherto shaped the life and destiny of many, many incarnations. Those divine life-currents of creative spiritual power are now his blood, so to speak, the forces which run throughout his being; in their midst he dwells, able to draw on the wisdom and power of the Eternal; able to wield the powers of the Eternal as powers of his proper nature. For he is the individual epitome of the Eternal, creative as that is, divine as that is.

Therefore the regeneration of the psychical body, whereby it becomes the spiritual body, makes the man a disciple. The regeneration, if such a term may rightly be used for the return-tide of spiritual life, of the causal body, makes the disciple a Master, an adept.

In each of these great regenerative acts, the way lies through perfect

self-abnegation, a complete resigning of all the wills of self, a filial obedience to each least will of the Eternal, the Father in heaven: "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love, as I have kept the Father's commandments and abide in his love," says the Master to his disciples.

It is, therefore, in measure as the personal man obeys each least dictate of spiritual law, that he becomes the spiritual man, the disciple. And in measure as the disciple obeys each least behest of the divine law, expressed through the will of his Master, he grows towards the great consummation which makes him, in his turn, the adept, the Master.

The law of his growth is obedience. The first practical steps have already been set forth, in the description of the four Attainments and the Six Treasures, since these are the qualifications for discipleship.

Shankaracharya, in his Catechism, then sets forth with admirable brevity the relation of these vestures to the ascending degrees of consciousness. It will be our task to follow him in these explanations, at the same time supplying the background from the Upanishad texts, in which the teaching was first given to the disciples of his land, in the far-off golden days.

CHARLES JOHNSTON.

(*To be continued*)

EARLY ENGLISH MYSTICS

IV

THE BLESSED ALCUIN

"If enough would follow your lofty zeal, perhaps a new, nay, a more illustrious, Athens would arise here in France; and our new Athens, radiant with Christ as its Ruler, would surpass all the wisdom of the Greeks."

"The people should be led, not followed. Pay no attention to those who say: 'The voice of the people is the voice of God.' *For the passions of the mob come close to insanity."* —ALCUIN to CHARLEMAGNE.

THE Venerable Bede is without doubt the most distinguished of the early scholars born in England. Alcuin stands second to Bede. But in the sphere of constructive influence at a time of great disorganisation, Alcuin attained an unsought eminence not possible to the secluded monk of Jarrow. Alcuin returned to the Gaulish provinces some of the great sum of good that had come thence to Britain by way of the great monastic centres at Lerins and Tours through St. Patrick and others. Alcuin was not the first to go from Britain back to the continent. Columbarnus of Ireland, as ardent and impulsive a missionary as Columba, had landed with a few followers in France about the year 585. He established a great monastery at Luxeuil, and made other centres in Switzerland and Italy. The most famous of these was the monastery at St. Gall. And Columbarnus drew up a rule of life that was long used over all the provinces in place of the more celebrated rule of St. Benedict. Other fiery Irish preachers went with the Gospel message along the Rhine and to other points. They led heroic and devout lives, and their names are enrolled among the saints. But the need for which Alcuin of York left the companionship of his master and friends was one greater than that to which the saintly missionaries ministered. And the task in which he achieved success was a more difficult one than the winning of converts through stirring words. He left a placid life of study in the Cathedral School of York, for the arduous work of conferring with a mighty king and aiding him to build up a new civilisation. He was a co-worker with Charlemagne in the stupendous effort to form out of barbarian tribes a European Empire, of which France would be the actual centre, and the Emperor of which would rule as an agent and vicar of the Master Christ.

Let us endeavor to review briefly and clearly some of the facts which served as foundation for that aspiration of a Christian Empire. Let us not at the very start deride it as a gorgeous childish fancy. Perhaps we may come to sympathise with that mediæval aspiration, and, consequently, to some understanding of the ideal and aim.

In the first place, then, a great abyss separates the Gaulish provinces which St. Patrick visited in the 4th century from the Gaulish provinces

in which Alcuin took up his abode in the 8th century. In that abyss the Roman Empire lay shattered. As the political power of Rome faded dimmer in the past, there decayed also in Gaul that culture which Christian teachers, who were Roman citizens, had spread. At the end of the 8th century, the splendor of St. Martin's school was only a memory. Everything had gone to ruin. There was no one connected with Tours, or indeed in France, able to make an effort at restoring the discipline. A foreigner, not a monk, namely Alcuin, had to be installed as Abbot. But as the wide-spread political power of the Roman State came to an end, there arose in its place a religion that centered also around Rome, and which became as much of a link between men of different nationalities as Roman citizenship had formerly been. Bede and Alcuin in northern England in the 7th and 8th century felt themselves as much a part of Rome, through a common faith, as Paul of Tarsus had done through political citizenship. One barbarian tribe after another migrated from the *terra incognita* of Eastern Europe into the familiar provinces of the old Empire. These tribes accepted in some one of its many forms—orthodox or heretical—the Christian faith; were baptised *en masse,* and continued their former mode of life, slightly modified in a new environment. Many of these tribes, such as the Goths, Vandals, Lombards, etc., had been visited and converted by missionaries who had accepted the Unitarian explanations of Arius: these explanations did away with the mysterious dual nature of Christ. But the tribe of the Franks had been more fortunate. They received the orthodox teaching—Christ a Divine Being in whom both the divine and the human natures are preserved through all time—a Personality alive on a higher plane than the human, yet vitally interested (to the point of total self-sacrifice) in the minutest incidents of human life. In 589, seventy-five years after Rome had fallen into the hands of Alaric the Goth, this tribe, the Franks, had made themselves masters of the region on both sides of the Rhine, Gaul and Germany. The Chief under whom the Frankish conquest was made was Clovis. He became King of the Frankish or French monarchy.

Among the traditions of the Order of the *Sacré Cœur* (Sacred Heart), there is one that concerns this barbarian King, Clovis. The Blessed Marguerite Marie who founded the Order in obedience to the express directions of her Master (as she narrates), is said to have mentioned this legend to Louis XIV, during an audience. She was endeavoring to lead the King into compliance with her Master's wish that the symbol of the Sacred Heart should be emblazoned upon the French banner. The holy woman adduced as a reason that King Clovis had presented France to the Master for His earthly kingdom.* A piece of

* That alleged act of Clovis may itself be the result of an earlier consecration. There is an older legend which says the three holy women, the three Marys, were sent to the south of France by the Master, after the Resurrection. There He instructed them in the way of meditation. Is it not possible that Clovis merely represents the outer active side of that earlier period of contemplation?

mediæval superstition, perhaps! Yet, as many hypotheses are advanced from which to consider and explain the ways of men and nations, perhaps it may be permitted to use the legend of Clovis as a working basis from which to consider the lives of Charlemagne and Alcuin. For the greatest event in the lifetime of the two men was the coronation of Charlemagne as Emperor in the year 800. If the initial absurdity, namely, that mediæval legend can be granted, possibly the explanations derived from it may be less absurd than the hypothesis itself.

One is tempted, however, to stop for a moment in consideration of that legend. Why should it be so absurd, incredible? In the *Gita,* Krishna is said to accept with gratitude a flower or leaf from anyone who makes the offering in love. The accounts given of Christ both by his disciples in Judea and by the many who have attained to intimacy with Him since the Judean incidents, represent Him as a mighty Master of Life. One record I have read says He is a Lord so magnanimous and gracious that He receives pleasure from a weed offered Him by a heart in love. Why should not so mighty a Lord, the great King of Kings, as He is often called, accept in simplicity as it was given in simplicity, the gift of that barbarian warrior? We have heard of the great Lodge of Masters that their interest is humanity, and that they are the powers who draw off, to direct for good, a portion of the mad torrents of the human flood. If we should try to get away from a material judgment of human events, to look at them spiritually, it may be that the gift of Clovis would appear an opportunity given to the Lodge for carrying out some of their benevolent intentions to men. At least nothing hinders from making of that supposition a hypothesis.

If the gift of Clovis in 589 established a connection between France and the Great Lodge, the steps that led up to the coronation of Charlemagne in 800 appear not so devious. The theory of government represented by that coronation is "sublime, but impracticable," a great historian declares. "Impracticable," one may perhaps maintain, if recorded history only is studied. For of the unwritten history of ancient Egypt there have come down to us rumors to the effect that the rulers were Adepts who filled the two functions of Priest and King. And, on the hypothesis that France had been accepted by the Lodge as a field for action, the mediæval ideal of a universal Empire composed of many nations united by the Christian faith might seem to be a direct inspiration of the Great Lodge. Like many other inspirations, this one would seem to have been distorted somewhat in coming to manifestation through the minds of the mediæval Christians. The direct suggestion from the Lodge in regard to government, we may suppose, was that of the Divine Priest-King, a holy Adept, who by the Divine Right of Lodge consent, directed and influenced, as King, the outer, social relations of men toward the end of the interior, religious life, of which he celebrated the mysteries

and sacraments.* That inward suggestion from the Lodge (a hypothesis only) was modified by the actual conditions of Europe. The aspiring believers who received that inspiration saw in ruin a former organisation which had united the western world politically. In place of the imperial power at Rome they saw the Bishop of that central city, and they thought he might, as a Vicar of a Divine Master, again unite the western world through a common religion. But throughout the European world the Christian religion was nominal. And the Roman Bishop had little power of direction and influence. Hence the necessity was felt of placing by the side of that supreme Priest, who was impotent in the outer world, a second Vicar, whose sphere of action should be the external world, with its social, civil and political relations. Thus arose, in the mediæval mind, the ideal of the two Vicars of Christ, the Emperor and the Pope: two peers, divinely commissioned and representing the two aspects and functions of the ancient Egyptian rulers. In its original and pure form, that theory of government did not subordinate the Emperor to the Pope; the two were peers, coöperative and complementary, parts of one whole, inadequate without the other, bearing the same relation to each other as Action and Contemplation.

It could be no part of the present article, to expatiate upon the wisdom of that mediæval aspiration, or to suggest that, as an ideal, it is a reality, and thus, something that lies ahead of us; for which, we, like the mediæval world, are not yet ready.† The exposition that has so far been made of that ancient ideal of government is necessary for making clear the life and work of Alcuin. For it was in furtherance of that ideal that Alcuin surrendered personal preference and left his country to attach himself to the only European monarch who was capable of performing the duties demanded of an Imperial Vicar.

Alcuin was born of a noble family in the north of England in 735, the year of Bede's death. In 732, Ægbert, a friend of Bede's, became Archbishop of York, and in execution of his duties, founded, in his Cathedral city, a school and library. Alcuin entered this school, as a young boy, and distinguished himself by his zeal for learning and his devotion. The Archbishop's school and library quickly gained renown. The Archbishop, like Bede, was an adherent to the Continental and Roman side of Christianity not to the Irish. Those Roman sympathies led to frequent visits to the imperial city, and from these visits many manuscripts were brought back for the Cathedral school. Alcuin has left a list of the authors to be found in the library. If the names be

---

* Certain parts of the Coronation-ceremony testify to the spiritual nature of the Emperor's position. Thus he received sword, globe and sceptre as symbols of lordship. He assisted in the celebration of the Communion (or Mass), and, like the Pope, partook of the wine as well as the wafer.

† It is interesting to remember that Napoleon looked upon himself as Charlemagne's successor, and declared that his relation with the Pope should be the same as was Charlemagne's.

compared with those with which the early Irish monks were familiar, one fact is striking. The library of York represented the Latin side of Christianity and classical antiquity—Jerome, Augustine, Virgil, Cicero, etc. Whereas the Irish scholars (for example, a fragment of St. Aileran, an Irish monk of the 7th century) could cite Origen, Philo, etc. In 766, Ægbert, the Archbishop died. His friend Ælbert, whom he had made Master of the school, succeeded to the Archbishopric. And Alcuin succeeded to the Mastership thus left vacant by Ælbert. At the same time Alcuin was ordained *deacon* in the Church. He never advanced beyond that rank to the priesthood. Alcuin kept up the intimacy between York and Rome, and during a journey in 780, saw and talked with Charles, King of the Franks (Charlemagne). Since the days of Charles Martel (Charlemagne's grandfather), in 732, the Kings of the Franks had responded to many calls for assistance from the Pope. For the heretical tribes that had settled in Italy (especially the Unitarian Lombards), did not hesitate to assail the orthodox Bishop even to the point of personal violence. Pepin, Charles Martel's son, had twice delivered the Pope (Gregory III) from his enemies, and Pepin's son, Charlemagne, rendered a similar service to Hadrian (I) and Leo (III). Charlamagne had received the Frankish crown in 758, and, after his succession, had warred not only against the Pope's disturbers in Italy, but against the Saracens in Spain, and the Saxons on his frontiers, gaining that splendor for which romancers and poets have rendered him thanks. He was an illustrious monarch in 780 when Alcuin first talked with him, and had received from the Pope, in recognition of his services, the suzerainty of the city Rome. The next year Alcuin was again in Italy, and again there was an interview with the King. The King invited Alcuin to leave his work at York and come over to the continent to assist in the rehabilitation of morals and learning. Alcuin accepted, with the proviso of royal and ecclesiastical permission. Both were granted, and in 782 he left England and became a member of the King's household at Aix-la-Chapelle. He went to England in 790 on a commission from Charlemagne to one of the English Kings, but returned to France and died there in 804, Abbot of St. Martin's monastery at Tours.

Alcuin's official position in Charlemagne's household was Master of the Palace School. This School (not a new thing) was composed of the King's family and connections—the King himself and Queen Livdgard, his sons, daughters and sister, sons-in-law, cousins, and several young men of noble birth and great abilities whom the King had drawn about him. Alcuin's official duty was a very difficult one—to instruct that strangely composed class in the liberal arts and sciences of the time (grammar, rhetoric, mathematics)—to instruct, and, while instructing, to answer the multitudinous questions that came up in their curious, eager, undisciplined, and, sometimes, malicious minds. It was the King's hope that the Palace School would serve as a nucleus and example for the nation: that serious attention to civilising studies in a school at the Court

would arouse similar zeal throughout his dominions, and that order and peace might ensue. Alcuin performed the duties of his official position until 796, though they were often irksome. For his pupils he wrote his "Grammar," "Rhetoric" and "Dialectics," and made the efforts for which he is to-day generally praised.

But along with that official position of Royal tutor, a second and real relation was established by Alcuin. He used that difficult task as an opportunity for making himself the spiritual mentor of his pupils, young as well as mature. These noble youths fulfilled their promises, and went out from the Palace to take positions of great importance in Charlemagne's domains—some in the Church, some in the State. Two became bishops, one a diplomat in Italy. So that Alcuin, after his retirement from public life to the abbacy of Tours, was counselling men in high station over all western Europe. And, as his duty and residence in France did not detach his interests from England he included the Kings and ecclesiastics of that island in his counsels and directions. The correspondence that Alcuin maintained until his death with the royal family, with men who had been students at the Palace, with the Kings and prelates of England, and elsewhere, is his important work, and it is a very valuable record. It is of far greater value than any of his formal writings, whether these be educational, controversial, or comments in explanation of the Scriptures.

The letters of Alcuin, nearly three hundred of them, in very readable Latin, are to be found, together with his other writings, in volumes 100 and 101 of the Abbé Migne's encyclopedic collection, the *Patrologiæ*. The letters and other writings are preserved in well-known manuscripts registered at the great English and continental libraries. The evidence of the letters proves that Alcuin was spiritual adviser to all Europe, and that by virtue of that position, he was *extra ordinem,* an uncanonical Pope, as it were. If the statement seems ludicrous, it must be remembered that Alcuin's position at Tours was altogether uncanonical. It has been said that the fame of St. Martin's monastery had died down in a complete moral and mental relaxation. The monastery lost its head in 796. There was no one of the Order fit to be entrusted with the reformation of the place. So Charlemagne deliberately installed Alcuin who was not a *monk,* nor even a *priest,* as *Abbot.* The letters justify the wisdom of that appointment. Spiritually, Alcuin was made for a Master of monks. He was penetrated with the spirit of St. Benedict's rule; his admonitions to monks and Abbots throughout Europe read as if they were St. Benedict's comment upon his own rule. Just as Alcuin's spiritual attainments fitted him for the Superior Generalship of an Order of monks, he was also, interiorly, better fitted for that other position of Vicar General of the Church, than the men who outwardly were recognised as Popes during his life. Charlemagne was Emperor, the active Vicar of Christendom; and Charlemagne's adviser was Alcuin, not

Popes Hadrian or Leo. Alcuin, much more than Hadrian or Leo, was the guardian of the Catholic Faith.

There is a letter extant from Charlemagne to Leo (III) in which the Emperor states his conception of the function of the two Vicars. The letter reads: "It is our task to protect the Holy Church of Christ from the heathen who assail it abroad, as well as to enforce a recognition of the Catholic faith within our borders. It is your duty, O Holy Father, to support our warlike service with hands uplifted to God, so that the Christian people, led of God, and aided by your prayers, may triumph everywhere." It was Alcuin who filled the Papal office here outlined by the Emperor. His reason for leaving England was not that he might do secular missionary work as Royal tutor, but that he might labor for the Catholic religion (*adjuvare in fide catholice*). He saw no ruler in England of sufficient force to act as the executive head of the Christian theocracy. He found that force in Charlemagne, and attached himself as friend. He was convinced of Charlemagne's aspiration and good will.* He undertook and performed the difficult task of modifying that forceful will that was so often turbulent. His success with the Emperor and with other nobles and prelates—for he was Father-confessor to all Europe—is explained by his profound humility. Humility may be sometimes thought of as a negative and passive quality. Its true essence is found in Alcuin's letters. They are firm and unhesitating in their insistence upon certain principles of rectitude, and in pointing out moral blemishes that must be removed. But the firmness and unhesitation are the qualities of a man who is acting in the capacity of agent, not from personal motives.

Alcuin's view of the Master's Kingdom on earth was largely formed from the Old Testament. It was that influence which caused him to name the Emperor "David," the name used in the letters. But in his concept of a Christian state there is none of the dreary Puritan and Scotch negativeness that has made the word "theocracy" an ill-favored one with us. He would make of France a second Athens, surpassing the splendor of the first as the new King, Christ, surpasses Plato. He knew that there was no other way toward that splendid goal than through moral transformation, the alchemical change of natural lead to spiritual gold (this was a point on which the Greeks failed). This clear recognition leads him to make of all his formal, secular teaching, an occasion for spiritual discipline. His delicate tact made him aware that those barbarian minds could not take a monk's or disciple's training. Convinced as he was of the spiritual prowess and earnestness of Charlemagne, he had yet to recognise that that force was encased in barbarian mentality. So he conveys discipline under cover of the intellectual deli-

* "I feel convinced of the Emperor's righteous intention, of his desire to have his Kingdom—which has been given him by God—a pattern of rectitude. Unfortunately there are more to hinder than to help him."

cacies they craved. Whether his apparent subject be grammar or rhetoric, his real subject is the discipline that acquires wisdom. He whets their desire, which was already eager for intellectual gain, and shows that intellectual culture can be gained only through spiritual discipline.*

The letters are very human. Usually they are plain and straightforward.† Only occasionally is there a rhetorical arabesque. He follows the Emperor closely in all his campaigns. The Emperor is a *necessity,* he feels, for Christendom. The Church could not maintain itself without him.** Alcuin endeavors to restrain the mistaken Imperial zeal that sent up conquered tribes for wholesale baptism. "Of what use," he writes to the monarch, "is it to baptise the body, when the character is left unchanged? Baptism is only the outward sign of a spiritual grace. Until the interior regeneration has been effected, so that they 'do the will' of the Father, outward baptism is a mockery." Then he draws up a plan of instruction, through which he would have the newly conquered heathen pass before they could fitly come to the baptismal Sacrament—a plan far too slow in accomplishment to please the energetic King. Again and again Alcuin endeavors to check the fiery zeal of the King who would have forced a recognition of the Church's sovereignty from his people, new and old, in the form of tithes. *"Esto in consiliis suavis"* (Be moderate) he writes. "You can get the tithes you exact, but payment of tithes does not make Christians. Consider a little how those of our own nation who have been born and grounded in the faith murmur at these payments. Do you think then that these crude heathen children can be forced into compliance? You associate the sacraments and the tithes in their minds. Because they abhor one, they will loathe the other. Let your bishops and priests give milk to these new-born babes. Put upon their shoulders the mild yoke of Christ. Do not turn your bishops into

---

* The following extracts are from Alcuin's *"Grammar."* His book on Rhetoric is entitled *"Rhetoric and the Virtues."* It is in the form of a dialogue between Charlemagne and Alcuin; the teaching is that the cardinal virtues are necessary for a mastery of the art of rhetoric.

> "It is easy indeed to point out to you the path of wisdom, if only ye love it for the sake of God, for knowledge, for purity of heart, for understanding the truth, yea, and for itself."
>
> "That which is sought from without is alien to the soul, as is the gathering together of riches, but that which is proper to the soul is what is within, namely, the graces of wisdom."
>
> "Spectavi, speravi, optabam: et ecce! quem spectavi, non venit, et quem speravi, non consideravi: quem optabam, non accipiebam. Frustrata est exspectatio, evacuata est spes. Et utinam pro spe esset praesentia! nunc esset plenum gaudium."

† Here is a good specimen. It is the beginning of a letter to Arno, Bishop of Salzburg.

** "Ecce in te solo tota salus Ecclesiarum Christi inclinata recumbit."

farmers of revenue. Let them pray, not prey (*Sint prædicatores, non prædatores*)."

In his numerous letters to ecclesiastics and monks, Alcuin's endeavor is to spur them into action. His duty toward the Emperor was to modify and restrain, hence, "*suaviter,*" (mildly) is an adverb often repeated. But among the ecclesiastics and monks there was a defect of zeal, both as regards outward duties, and also the duty of interior discipline. "*Vult beatus esse et non vult laborare, unde beatus fiat.*" Hence one phrase is used over and over again in the letters whether to England, France or Germany. "*Viriliter fac et fortiter,*" (Be virile and strong). His ideal monk is a well-trained athlete—*doctissime athleta.* He tells the monks of Lindisfarne, that the pagan inroads which have desecrated St. Cuthbert's shrine are the result of their moral degeneration. Upon all he urges the active acceptance of holy obedience, that weapon bright and strong which St. Benedict had put in their hands against self-will, against the sloth of disobedience. "As a man of the world strives daily to increase his wealth, so a man of religion should strive daily to lay up treasure in heaven."*

The letters to the Bishop of Salzburg, Arno, one of the young men of the Palace School, abound with affection, and add to the warm vitality of the whole correspondence. Alcuin's feeling for the King was reverence, friendship and gratitude. But to Arno he felt as a father, and poured out upon him paternal affection. He longs for Arno's letters more than for those from York even. He waits in eager and enthusiastic expectation for a visit from this son: "*Veni, veni, festinanter!*" He is disappointed and restless when the visit is interfered with, though he takes his disappointment with humor.

Throughout the whole correspondence Alcuin is intensely and unwaveringly Roman in his adherence. He writes a long letter to the monks spread throughout Ireland. He praises them for the strictness of their discipline, and for their very great erudition. But he warns them against a position outside the Roman tradition, and asks them to begin at once to learn religion according to Roman use and authority. They ought to avoid studies outside those approved by Roman fathers. The Catholic Church, he writes, ought to be everywhere the same, and without any variations. He writes very urgently to Charlemagne from Tours against Irish priests who had been received into the Palace. They bring with them Egyptian modes of thought and worship (that is, from Alexandria), and their influence cannot but be subversive. Alcuin had nothing of the Celt in his temper. He is not philosophical. He was quite content to remain on the surface of morals and religion, without seeking the underlying, cosmical principles. He is not a mystic at all. But it has been necessary to include him in this series because he is the bridge between

---

* "How blessed is the monastic life! it is pleasing to God, lovely to the Angels and honorable among men."

two periods. His very limitations, his un-Celtic temper fitted him for his task. The need in 780 was not speculation and the unclosing of philosophical truth. It was organisation upon fundamental principles. He did all he could to nullify the Celtic influences which he detested and feared. But his substantial work, thanks to the wisdom of the Lodge, was only preparation for the greatest of the Irish scholars. Alcuin died in 804, leaving several of his pupils to solidify his work. Forty years after his death, in the reign of Charlemagne's grandson, Erigena came over from Ireland, by royal invitation to take the position in the Palace that Alcuin had filled. Erigena is the most philosophical mystic of the Middle Age. From him, rather through him, the inner life of the French Church—the mystical life, proceeded. And it was by his influence that the later English mystics, Rolle, Hilton and others, were formed.

SPENSER MONTAGUE.

"We must follow in all things the authority of the Holy Scriptures, for the truth is there enclosed as in a secret sanctuary; but we must not think that, in order to endow us with the divine nature, the holy scripture always employs precise and literal words and signs; it makes use of similitudes and figurative expressions, adapts itself to our weakness, and raises, by a simple mode of teaching, our dull and immature spirits."

JOHN SCOTUS ERIGENA.

CONCERNING THE REAL AND CONCERNING SHADOWS

(*Continued from the July issue*)

Concerning Shadows

IF the intention is the direct method of approach to reality and if poetry is its expression, how may poetry be known? Granted that it need not be rhymed verse, or even verse, what hall-mark does it bear, if any, by which it can be distinguished? First, it must *feel* like poetry, must produce a state of rapture, must inspire. Second, it speaks, not like the intellect in carefully weighed terms which limit as they define, but in symbols, shadow pictures of something which is and at the same time is not like the shadow. This is to say that the shadow suggests the reality but is not it. The nature of shadows does not permit them to more than thinly and faintly image forth the real.

When a poet says of a beautiful woman that her eyes are stars, he, of course, does not mean that they *are* stars, but that certain qualities such as brightness, clearness, the sense of steadiness, of always being there—the same, are characteristic of both. And the eyes which are not known to the reader can be pictured to his imagination vividly enough by means of the stars which are.

It may seem ingenuously simple to insist just here that symbols must not be pressed, that shadows must be sharply distinguished from realities. By pressing a symbol we harden it, crystalize it, and so destroy its expansiveness, its great power of visualizing the unseen. To him who insists on the definite outline and construction of the yellow primrose it is, and must always remain, no more than that. But to him who relaxes his grip on its finite definiteness for the sake of its power of suggestion, it points with unerring accuracy to something beyond itself, something forever hidden from the eye of the literalist and just as eternally and inevitably visible to the inner eye of the poet. The danger of misunderstanding the nature and functions of shadows is vital, and perversive of their great value to man.

It is characteristic of the intuition that in the search for the real it reaches beyond the intellect. Where reason stumbles or falls, intuition walks with firm tread. And this it does largely by virtue of its incompleteness. The mind defines, attempts to contain, and fully present truth. Once grant man's finiteness, his provincial position in the universe, and the futility of this method of approach to reality is clear. But intuition, wiser, points toward the truth which it is impossible for man's mind to contain. The discreet philosopher questioned as to

whether he believes in God replies, "Yes, if you don't ask me to define him." To attempt to define God is an absurdity. Can the less contain the greater? No. But it can picture it, point toward it, comprehend it, in some measure, intuitively by symbols. God as a wielder of thunderbolts, a king, a father, a circle whose centre is everywhere and his circumference nowhere, the Great Breath is to some extent at least understandable, and, what is, perhaps, more to the point, inspirational, dynamic.

So with parables. A parable is an expanded symbol, a picture of life in movement instead of a picture of a thing. Accordingly in describing the kingdom of heaven, which is a matter of growth, parables are used inevitably. It is a pearl of great price to be had only at the surrender of all else, a grain of mustard seed, small at first but with vast power of development within it. And he who enters the kingdom is not analysed, his qualifications enumerated. He is a lamb, a little child. And the symbol really explains.

If, therefore, a symbol is an inadequate expression of truth it is, in the nature of the case, less inadequate than an intellectual statement. The language of the mind is of the letter and killeth, the language of the intuition is of the spirit and maketh alive. Poetic truth is inspirational because life-transmitting. It feeds the inner man just as the substance of this material world feeds the outer man. The truth of a symbol is tested pragmatically by its power to nourish and inspire. In so far as it accomplishes these results it is man's normal food, and true—that is it makes possible his relation with a true reality. True symbols are recognized. Man knows them as a wild beast knows his food. They have a compelling power.

The basis of symbolism is the law of correspondences—the theory that the universe is the characteristic expression of the nature of deity, that in sum as in detail one plan prevails throughout, and that that plan cannot change—only develop—because it is of the nature of the one unchangeable reality. This is law. In every atom in space God's face is mirrored. Just so a theme in a symphony is always the same theme though expanded into variations or concentrated in a simple melody, though voiced in flute or 'cello. To question the validity of the language of symbols is, therefore, to cast doubt on the integrity of God.

And herein lies an obligation for conscious beings. Just as forms lower in the evolutionary movement express unconsciously but with fidelity the nature of God, so conscious beings must by virtue of their consciousness coöperate in his self-expression, must, so far as possible, open themselves as channels for the expression of his nature as it exists in them. They must not only be their real selves, but they must picture forth that reality truly by every symbol of language or action that is within their sphere of self-expression. To misrepresent the reality of which they, too, are shadows is to undermine, so far as in them lies, the stability of the universe.

Except as it is recognized as a shadow how can the great power of nature to nourish and inspire be explained? How, unless it is in truth what the poets have recognized it to be, the garment of God by which we see him? This is the vision of truth which Goethe has given us so clearly through the personality of the Earth-Spirit:

"Thus at the roaring loom of time I work,
And weave the living garment of deity."

The same thought in the symbolism of the esoteric East is that the world as we see it is but the reflection of a real world which supports and sustains it. Through intimacy with nature we are led to the reality which she mirrors. The expanse, the calm, the power of the sea are symbols that carry meaning. The peace of a fertile valley is esoteric. How many men have been inspired to keener effort and clearer faith by the contemplation of mountains springing up from dark, harsh, and irregular bases to poised domes of grandeur, which reflect the clear light of the sun above clouds. Even such a commonplace of nature as marsh land has its message, its power to sustain and inspire, its insistance on itself as a shadow, the function of which is to compel recognition for the real.

"Ye marshes, how candid and simple and nothing-withholding and free
Ye publish yourselves to the sky and offer yourselves to the sea!
Tolerant plains, that suffer the sea and the rains and the sun,
Ye spread and span like the catholic man who has mightily won
God out of knowledge and good out of infinite pain
And sight out of blindness and purity out of a stain.

"As the marsh-hen secretly builds on the watery sod,
Behold I will build me a nest on the greatness of God:
I will fly in the greatness of God as the marsh-hen flies
In the freedom that fills all the space 'twixt the marsh and the skies:
By so many roots as the marsh-grass sends in the sod
I will heartily lay me a-hold on the greatness of God:
Oh, like to the greatness of God is the greatness within
The range of the marshes, the liberal marshes of Glynn." [21]

If nature has an outer court she has also a holy place for her priests. But the high priest of nature to whom the holy of holies was open was the poet Wordsworth. The meaning and rationale of symbols he understood. From the shadow he advanced consciously to the reality. Let us read his own interpretation of the parable of nature.

---

[21] Lanier, Sidney; *The Marshes of Glynn.*

"For nature then
To me was all in all.—I cannot paint
What then I was. The sounding cataract
Haunted me like a passion: the tall rock,
The mountain, and the deep and gloomy wood,
Their colours and their forms, were then to me
An appetite; a feeling and a love,
That had no need of charm,
By thought supplied, nor any interest
Unborrowed from the eye.—That time is past,
And all its aching joys are now no more,
And all its dizzy raptures. Not for this
Faint I, nor mourn nor murmur; other gifts
Have followed; for such loss I would believe,
Abundant recompense. For I have learned
To look on nature, not as in the hour
Of thoughtless youth; but hearing oftentimes
The still, sad music of humanity,
Nor harsh nor grating, though of ample power
To chasten and subdue. Once I have felt
A presence that disturbs me with the joy
Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean and the living air,
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man;
A motion and a spirit, that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought
And rolls through all things. Therefore am I still
A lover of the meadows and the woods,
And mountains; and of all that we behold
From this green earth; of all the mighty world
Of eye and ear,—both what they half create,
And what perceive; well pleased to recognize
In nature and the language of the sense,
The anchor of my purest thoughts, the nurse,
The guide, the guardian of my heart, and soul
Of all my moral being." [22]

Not only is it possible for man to approach reality by means of shadows, it is inevitable that he should do so. Man is at present, to some extent at least, a material being. He lives in a world which expresses itself to him as a complex, more or less ordered and related system of material things of which he is part, and to the different aspects of which

[22] Wordsworth, William; *Lines composed a few miles above Tintern Abbey.*

his study and contemplation are in the main confined. Whether he frankly recognizes this limitation as in himself or believes it to be a limitation of reality does not alter the fact that it acts as a restriction.

But on the substance of reality as man sees it, there falls a shadow, which he does not recognize as reflecting any of the objects which he knows, which, on analysis, reveals itself as of a different nature, belonging to a different order. According to his particular personal development does the shadow take form: in the ideal of beauty if his æsthetic nature is in the ascendant, in the ideal of truth disinterestedly sought if his mind predominates, in the ideal of righteousness if his will to action is the determining principle of his personality. Whence comes this shadow? he asks; and in asking this he takes his first step toward the real. By recognizing the shadow as such he gains his first intuitive perception of the reality which it reflects. The function of shadows, therefore, is to point.

All shadows point. Like everything else in nature they are dynamic or retrogressive. The great thing to know of a shadow is which way it points—its tendency of direction. Does it point, so to speak, up or down, toward or away from—the real. If it points toward reality it is a true shadow, if away from reality it is a false shadow and a lie. This is the test, the only one of any value. The standard of judgment for shadows is not what they are in themselves or the particular position they occupy, but what they reflect—their tendency of direction, which way they point.

By this touchstone must we judge all the great symbols of human life. Every form of art may elevate or degrade. Painting, sculpture, music, dancing even, possess within themselves this double possibility of direction. And they possess no third, no potential immobility. The great life force of love between man and woman may point up toward its root in the spirit or down toward its disintegration in the flesh. The noble and inspiring ideal of the brotherhood of man may point up toward the spiritual unity on which all life is based, or it may point down toward materialism and disruption. The swinging censer of a ritualistic service may point up to the sense of God's spirit spread abroad as a blessing, or it may point down to mere sensuous gratification. The much disputed eucharist may point up to a keen sense of the indwelling presence of Christ in the souls of his disciples, or it may point down to an irrational and mechanical conception of the miraculous.

All life implies growth, development, and so direction, and man will never conceivably outgrow the necessity for tending somewhither. If the time comes when, sensing the reality clearly, some discard the language of shadows for a more direct approach, that does not diminish the value of these first steps on the path to the real to us who do not yet stand where they stand.

LOUISE EDGAR PETERS.

THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN

THE MOST RECENT SCIENCE COMES CLOSE TO THE SECRET DOCTRINE

IT is a proof of the illimitable power of the human spirit that the more we learn, the easier it becomes to add greatly to our knowledge. A striking example of this is the prehistoric record of the human race, which has been studied uninterruptedly since Boucher de Perthes first collected flint implements from the gravels of Picardy in 1841; yet the last ten years have seen more striking discoveries, perhaps, than did the preceding sixty, discoveries which add an abundance of new material, and open up new and wonderful horizons.

Our new materials are of two kinds: first, actual remains, in the form of fossil bones, of men and women who lived at periods almost inconceivably remote; and, secondly, the handiwork of these immensely ancient human beings, ranging from the rudely chipped flints, which are called eoliths, to the beautiful polychrome pictures of extinct animals like the mammoth, and of bisons and horses, on the walls and roofs of the caverns in the limestone region of southern France and northern Spain. Of materials of the first class, fossil human bones, the last few years have seen discoveries of extraordinary interest and value; for example, those found in France at la Grotte des Enfants, in 1906, at Le Moustier and La Chapelle aux Saints in 1908, at La Ferrassie, Combe Capelle and Pech de l'Aze in 1909, at St. Brélade in the island of Jersey in 1910 and 1911; in Andalusia in 1910, and at Piltdown in Sussex, England, the discovery announced within the last few months, though it was made somewhat earlier. In the second class, most interesting for their high artistic value are the cave paintings of France and Spain, which have been abundantly described and illustrated, notably in the beautiful volumes published by the Prince of Monaco; most interesting for their high antiquity are the flint implements called eoliths, which we shall presently consider.

A good many of these recently discovered human fossils are skulls or parts of skulls; and this at once suggests the measuring of their brain capacity, and its comparison with our modern brains on the one hand, and certain ancient and famous brain cases on the other. Two of these are the so-called Pithecanthropus skull-fragment found at Trinil in Java by Professor Dubois in 1891, which was hailed at the time as the Darwinian "missing link" between the apes and man; and the skull found in the Neanderthal in 1856, which, with its low arch and heavy brows, may be supposed to stand somewhere between the Pithecanthropus or ape-man and our present humanity. One of the most remarkable results of recent discoveries is to show that brains almost as large as our own

go back to inconceivably remote periods; and that, as a probable consequence, neither the Pithecanthropus nor the Neanderthal man are to be reckoned among our direct ancestors at all.

Two ancient skulls are especially important for their bearing on this question. They were both found in the south of England, in thick beds of alluvial gravel, laid down by rivers where there are no rivers now. The height of these ancient river gravels above the present level of the rivers is one way of measuring their antiquity. The presence of fossil remains of long extinct animals, ancestral forms of the elephant, the hippopotamus, the rhinoceros, which were all plentiful at one time in England, is another. The first of these two ancient English skulls was found in a gravel pit at Galley Hill in Kent, forming part of a former bank of the river Thames, which was then far larger than now. The gravel is ten feet thick. The skeleton was found eight feet beneath its surface. Fossils of animals found in the same gravel point toward the Pliocene period, the most recent of the four divisions of the Tertiary period, which immediately preceded the Pleistocene or Quaternary, which comes down to our own times. In spite of this enormous age, the Galley Hill skull "does not in fact differ essentially from its modern European counterparts; similar conclusions have been formed in regard to the other parts of the skeleton." It is reasonably inferred that, if men of the higher Galley Hill type preceded in point of time the men of the lower Neanderthal type, as seems certain, the ancestry of the former, higher type must be sought at a far earlier period than that represented by the Galley Hill gravels. As to this, it may be noted, according to Duckworth, that the extension of the human period suggested by eoliths, rudely chipped flints, for which Pliocene, Miocene and even Oligocene antiquity is claimed, will provide all, and more than all, that this argument demands. But if this be so, the significance of the Neanderthal type of skeleton is profoundly altered. It is no longer only possible to claim an ancestral position for that type in its relation to modern men. It may be regarded as a degenerate form. Should it be regarded as such, a probability exists that it ultimately became extinct, like the Tasmanian aborigines in our own days.

The other very ancient English skull, which was found at Piltdown in Sussex, is assigned to the Pliocene period. A distinguished French anthropologist declares that, along with certain primitive characteristics, it possesses traits which connect it more clearly with the ancestry of modern man than the Neanderthal type. In this case, the Neanderthal type would represent a lateral branch, not an ancestor of modern man; and the origin of our direct ancestors would thus be pushed far back into the past; how far, we shall presently try to estimate.

The question at once comes into our minds: What bearing has this on the descent of man, and especially on what are popularly called our "monkey ancestors"; the question of our descent from forms like the

orang-utan or the gorilla? This question has recently been pretty thoroughly canvassed, and we may, perhaps, sum up the best opinion as follows: Evidence, of which this is the type, makes it quite possible that man is not descended from the anthropoid apes, but even the contrary may be true, and the anthropoid apes may belong to a lateral branch of the human stem; just as man and the anthropoid apes may be only two branches of a common stem. It is very difficult to trace the descent of man from the anthropoid apes, for we are entirely without paleontological proof enabling us to determine the character of the anthropoid apes of the middle and lower Tertiary, which should be the ancestors of the present anthropoid apes. The assertion of Ernst Haeckel, that we are in possession of all the transitional forms from the lower anthropoid apes to man, is totally inaccurate. This bears directly on the so-called "missing link," the Pithecanthropus of Java, which would thus appear to be a lateral branch, and not an ancestor; an earlier offshoot, perhaps, than the Neanderthal race. The age of the Pithecanthropus cannot be exactly determined. In the opinion of the majority of those who have examined the question, it may date from the middle or upper quaternary; in which case, it is undoubtedly more recent than far more highly developed forms like the Piltdown and Galley Hill skulls. We may say, with a distinguished English geologist that, while we believe firmly in the evolution of man, the bulk of his brain does not seem to have appreciably increased since the early ages of stone. Small-brained forms like the Pithecanthropus and, in a less degree, the Neanderthal man, are not ancestors, not in the direct line of our descent.

To turn now to the ancient implements which, side by side with human fossils, testify to the antiquity of man. We are, I suppose, familiar with the fact that, before iron came into use, many common implements were made of bronze, and still earlier, of copper. Earlier still, they were made of stone, flint being very commonly used. The later flints were polished, and often very finely shaped. The older flints were chipped, but not polished. The later flints are called "neoliths," or "new stones," the older being called "paleoliths," or "old stones." The neoliths seem to cover only a comparatively short period, lasting, however, many thousand years. But the paleoliths seem to stretch over a vastly longer period, divided into no less than nine different strata or periods of culture and development. From the various localities in which relics characteristic of these different periods have been found, it is at present the custom to name these different paleolithic levels as follows, beginnings with the more recent, and going back to the older: there is, first, the Azilian, which is the bridge between chipped flints and polished flints; behind this, in increasing antiquity, are the ages called Magdalenian, Solutrean, Aurignacian, Acheulean, Chellean, Strepyan, Mesvinian, and Mafflian. To make this a little more concrete, we may say that to the Aurignacian period belong the best of the cave pictures

of France and Spain; to the Mousterian belongs the low, heavy-browed Neanderthal race; to the Strepyan, or perhaps even to the much older Mafflian, belongs the well-formed skull from Galley Hill.

Now the remarkable fact is, that behind these nine ages of paleoliths a series of far older epochs has recently been detected, the very rudely chipped implements of which are called "eoliths," or "stones of the dawn" of human culture. The author of *The Romance of Modern Geology* (1909) gives us a general view of the situation by saying that flint implements of much rougher types than the paleoliths have been found in old river gravels which are from five hundred to seven hundred feet above the level of the existing rivers, in the drift of which paleolithic implements were found. To these older, clumsier weapons and tools—if, indeed, implements they be—the name eoliths was given. These eoliths of the south of England and of Belgium indicate a race of men of less developed skill than the makers of the paleoliths and carry the antiquity of man at least as far back beyond the paleoliths as these are from the present day.

Since this was written, rudely chipped flints of this type have been found in strata much more ancient than those which this writer had in mind. A notable discovery is that of Mr. Reid Moir, who found worked flints of this type in undisturbed strata lying below the Suffolk Red Crag at Ipswich. The top of the London clay was a land surface before the deposition of the Red Crag, and on this land surface were lying the implements which are now deeply covered up by the sand and shells of the Pliocene sea; these implements had been flaked by dexterous blows, and they have been assigned to late Miocene or early Pliocene times. But other eoliths go back much farther than this. Professor Rutot assigns some of these to the Oligocene period. M. Laville has discovered yet others at Duan, some fifty or sixty miles southwest of Paris, which he assigns to the Eocene period, the oldest of the four periods into which the Tertiary epoch of geology is divided. In their order, these are: Eocene, Oligocene, Miocene, Pliocene; followed by the Pleistocene or Quaternary, which comes down to the present day. It has already been pointed out that the vast antiquity indicated by these eolithic implements is almost demanded by the facts revealed by skulls like that of Galley Hill and Piltdown, with their large brain capacity, indicating that ages of development had preceded them.

Turning from the materials to our first problem, the way in which their age is measured, we may say that there are two methods, the one direct, the other indirect. The first gives far more certain conclusions; but, unfortunately, it does not carry us nearly as far back as we wish to go; therefore we have to adopt the second method for the rest of our journey. The direct method may be illustrated in this way. We all know that the age of many trees may be exactly measured by counting the concentric rings in a cross section of the stem; the change from

summer to winter making a difference in the texture of the woody fibre. In this way pine trees two or three or four hundred years old have been measured, while trees like the Californian sequoia may go back two milleniums. There is a similar natural chronometer in the texture of peat, which is composed of layers of small water plants that grow in summer and wither in winter. A careful count has shown that a foot of black peat is made up of eight hundred of these layers, showing that eight hundred summers and winters went to the building of it. If we find human relics in undisturbed peat at a depth of five feet from the surface, we shall be justified in saying that they are four thousand years old. This is strikingly corroborated by discoveries made in the peat of the Somme valley in northern France. Roman pottery, among other things a wide, flat dish which could not sink through the peat, was discovered at a depth of two feet, dating, that is, from sixteen hundred years ago. Below this were found Gaulish remains; below these, flint implements. From the character and position of the Roman remains, it was calculated that peat forms at the rate of three centimeters a century, practically the same result as that obtained by counting the layers.

We are carried a good deal further back by observations made in the delta of the little river Tinière which flows into the lake of Geneva near Villeneuve not far from where the Rhone enters the lake. The structure of the delta is revealed by a railroad cut. At different distances below the surface three layers of vegetable soil are found, each of which was at one time the surface of the delta. Four feet below the present surface is the first vegetable layer, five inches thick. In this was found a Roman coin eighteen hundred years old. Ten feet below the surface there was a second layer of vegetable soil six inches thick, in which was found a pair of bronze tweezers, dating, therefore, some four thousand years back. Nineteen feet below the surface there is a third layer, which goes back about seven thousand years, the whole delta being some ten thousand years old. There is a higher and older delta ten times as large; if laid down at the same rate, it was begun a hundred thousand years ago. A similar method applied to the sediment of the Nile gives like results. Yet another means of measurement is offered by the growth of peat which is filling up some of the Swiss lakes, like the lake of Brienne, so that lake dwellings which were once within its waters are now far from the lake. In the same way the old cities of Mesopotamia, once on the shore of the Persian Gulf, are now far inland, the Gulf being gradually filled up by sand and mud brought down by the two rivers.

But these direct methods do not carry us far enough. We may then turn to the indirect method, based on estimates of the length of time required to form the whole of the stratified and fossil-bearing rocks of the earth. The total thickness of these rocks in Europe has been estimated at 75,000 feet or fourteen miles. Let us strike an average among

many estimates, and say that the whole of it was laid down in 200,000,000 years. More than fifty per cent. of this total belongs to the primordial period; more than thirty to the primary; about twelve to the secondary; two and a half per cent., or, say, five million years, to the Tertiary, which is subdivided in turn into the Eocene, Oligocene, Miocene and Pliocene; and finally one-half per cent., or a million years, to the Pleistocene or Quaternary. These figures make no claim at all to exactitude. They are rough deductions from rather uncertain data, and must be taken for what they are worth. But they are the best we can get at present.

We can see at a glance that, if the Piltdown skull is, as is claimed for it, of pre-Pleistocene age, this antique Englishman may lay claim to a venerable antiquity; and, if the eoliths of Oligocene and even Eocene age be accepted, they go back, and carry with them the history of mankind, literally millions of years.

Into the discussion of their genuineness we cannot enter, nor relate the wordy battles between the eolithophils and eolithophobes as Professor Rutot wittily calls them, he himself holding out for Oligocene man. The objectors say that certain flint fragments of like character are produced in the cement mills at Mantes, showing that the eoliths are not the work of man. Surely this is in the last degree illogical, as though cement mills occurred in nature and were not man-made. We can only contribute to the controversy a sentence by Sir Charles Lyell, written fifty years ago, and referring to the then comparatively recent finding of neolithic and paleolithic implements: "The scientific world had no faith in the statement that works of art, however rude, had been met with in undisturbed beds of such antiquity . . . many imagined them to have owed their peculiar forms to accidental fracture in a river bed." Which shows a certain uniformity in the workings of the scientific mind.

JOHN CHARLTON.

SOME ASPECTS OF THEOSOPHY

As Seen by a New Member of the Society

IX

CONSIDERING WHAT "A UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD" MAY MEAN

". . . . learn charity, and mark that as your brother's truth exists not for your soul, so yours does not exist for him, and yet that at their heart they both are one, it matters not how diverse they may seem. For Truth is One, Unchangeable, Eternal."—Fragments, p. 63.

ELSEWHERE I have told of my indebtedness to the wondrous little book from which is taken the quotation with which this begins. Those few lines often seem to me to express, almost to embody, the whole of Theosophy as a Philosophy. It was that quotation as much as anything else that gave me courage to apply for the privilege of membership when my mind was still utterly refusing to accept a great deal that seemed to be involved.

Turn to the inside cover page of this Quarterly and read the statement about the Theosophical Society. The very first sentence was to me a hazard, as they say in steeplechasing. "The principal aim and object of this Society is to form the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste or color." In my natural tendency to confuse planes, to see only the surface and not the substance, to listen to the words and not the meaning, I balked at that statement. But I believed in the members of the T. S. whom I knew. I trusted the teachings of Cavé and I made application, feeling that I accepted the T. S. as a whole, even if I did not understand it in many particulars. I had read "By their fruits ye shall know them" and there could be no doubt on this score. It was in part, moreover, by intuition; and in further part, blind faith in a Mentor and his Companions, whom I have learned to reverence, to trust and to love, that I took that important first step; and never for an instant have I regretted it. While I was permitted to be enrolled in the Society I see I had not joined it. Sometimes I wonder whether I shall ever be truly joined to it! One of those whom I am privileged to follow, a long-time member, says "One keeps on joining the Society year after year."

This presents one of the most striking aspects of Theosophy, that in one's attitude toward it one seems literally to follow the ascending spiral of growth so vividly described in its literature. Something familiar today shows itself absolutely new tomorrow. Experience with this phase of growth is most encouraging to the beginner, for it gives

validity to his intuition that what he may not understand now will be made clear if he will but persevere and wait in faith. I suspect that this is one of the real reasons why to the faithful Death has no sting.

A possible explanation for this changing aspect may be found in what seems to be the Law of Occultism in the East, of Mysticism in the West, that "one must be a thing to know it." A coward may admire courage but it takes a brave man to feel it, to be courageous. Truly, so it seems, "Knowledge comes with being." So, as we grow we are, and so know.

Not understanding that "principal aim and object" I kept it at first deliberately in the background of my objecting mind. Later this did not seem honest. I was in the T. S. (not of it, though I did not know this then) and it was my duty, I so felt, to accept its platform in words, because I believed absolutely in that platform as expressed and manifested by those who stood upon it. So I arbitrarily forced my mind to accept the platform as "Law and the Prophets." I did not take it in; make it part of myself.

Is not this, by the way, rather too much the attitude of most of us who call ourselves Christians and glibly recite by rote what we never make part of ourselves—though we do listen reverently to the petition: "That what we have said and sung with our lips we may believe in our hearts and show forth in our lives." I, for one, would regret to be put to the test on the Day of Judgment on my practical application of that prayer —or, indeed, any single one of the prayers I have used for years in church. And, I very much fear, that I am part of a large "brotherhood" in this respect. I wish that all of us could have the light thrown upon and into these prayers that membership in the T. S. has brought to many of us.

Through the Society I have found some of the verities of the church service, "discovering" that Theosophy is the basis, the essence, the truth of Christianity. But it has been said "It takes thousands of lives to make oneself a Theosophist." So, perhaps we are nothing more than stupid in not realizing that the Christian services and prayers are a practical manual of rules for daily life—as well as for reading or listening to in church. Yet I suspect that even this stupidity will not excuse us, if we do not make the effort.

Years and years ago I was properly taught the shibboleth, if I may be pardoned for so calling it, that we are all "children of one Father" but, as with many others I know, this was something right to say, something eminently proper to hold as an official belief—yet it meant nothing; meaning nothing one could not truly regard oneself as His child. Theoretically, however, every one who professes Christianity automatically professes belief in a "universal brotherhood." It is so theoretical for most of us that we do not see it. I am sure I did not see it at all until very recently and then something that was taught to and understood by the little children in Egypt thousands of years ago came to me in the

XXth Century as a brand new "discovery," a "surprising fact." Is it not wonderful that there is so much Patience with us!

I doubt if in this matter of a "universal brotherhood" I even made a "discovery." I was pushed into it by Mr. Judge through reading *Letters that Have Helped Me,* and yet how stupid I was about those books. When I first tried to read them—I just could not. They then meant nothing to me. Now they rank with *Light on the Path, Fragments,* the *Book of Common Prayer,* the *Bhagavad Gita,* the *Imitation of Christ* and the other great books that membership in the T. S. has taught me to value.

It may be useless to give this list of different ways of presenting identically the same teaching; but I wish I could make even one aspirant see the need for guidance. If he is not so placed as to be able to receive oral teachings from those with whom mere personal contact is itself an inspiration, he can always get that "bit of her heart" that the Editor-in-Chief of THE QUARTERLY reported went with every letter the Secretary of the T. S. writes. One who has fallen into a ditch should warn wayfarers of its location. I fell in—fell deep—so I feel it a duty to warn against self-guidance. It so easily drops one deeper into self-satisfaction; that into self-indulgence and that into self-disaster—though how we do hate to admit this; how we blame the "cruel Fates," not seeing that we have inexorably forced our own Fate.

This may seem a roundabout way of telling how I have reached a glimpse of what "Universal Brotherhood" may mean. Truly it is not. These digressions are symbolical of my own progress, of the cavortings and plungings of my own mind as it "shied off" from the concept's acceptance, as from Mr. Judge's *Letters.* But after the loving teachings given to me when I took guidance, just as after all these wanderings we return to our subject, so I came back recently to Mr. Judge. With a directness; a simplicity; a fiery power that makes all his books thrilling and enthralling, Mr. Judge preaches to me that to work for others is the one means of progress. Apparently, too, one is not to dream of so working in some far-off "cannibal isle," but is to go to work "here and now," as he so often wrote. This has given a meaning to the Answer in the Catechism "And to do my duty in that state of life unto which it shall please God to call me." Mr. Judge said at the end: "They must aim to develop themselves in daily life in small duties." Do we?

I knew the catechism by heart when I was confirmed. I have drilled classes in Sunday School in it. But, literally, the answer to the question, "What is thy duty towards thy Neighbor" and the marvellous comment by the "Catechist" had no real meaning to me until I sensed something of "universal brotherhood," and I suspect that if it ever had had I should not have been so long in accepting the

"principal aim and object" of the Society as something for which I now wish to strive.

To those who know the *Gita* the comment might have been made by Krishna to Arjuna:

"*Catechist.*—My good Child, know this; that thou art not able to do these things of thyself, nor to walk in the Commandments of God, and to serve him, without his special grace; which thou must learn at all times to call for by diligent prayer."

Despite our Lord's use of the word "children" as "followers," "disciples," despite the impressive fact that "chela" means child; just because the Catechism is taught in Sunday School to children in years, we "grown-ups" (in years only, alas!) fail to grasp the help offered in this passage and all through the church services. What idiots we are! Read the Collect for All Saints' Day for a statement of the principal aim and object of the Society in beautiful old English and in canonical form. Read them both in comparison so that you may get the full meaning of each from the other.

It has come to me that universal brotherhood is primarily on the inner plane. I had objected to it as involving a destruction of the whole organization of the world as we see it—from my family to the National Government. I had not realized what has ever been taught in all manifestations of Theosophy, as recently emphasized at the Convention of the T. S., that the spiritual works from within out and never in reverse. I had not accepted the principle that "here and now" we are to learn our Lesson. I am in one circumstance; Tony who blacks my boots in another. We can be brothers on a spiritual plane without my seeking to put him in my physical position; where, being unprepared he might find the circumstances destructive of spiritual advancement, just as I might if I took his place.

Whenever I have tried to mold my own or others' outer lives I have had experiences that remind me of the man who thought he would start an avalanche of his own by jumping down the mountain side. When they dug him out and thawed him out; patched him up and put him together, there was something less than half a man left, who declared "I guess after this I'll let the Almighty run His own avalanches." I, too, prefer not to interfere with what Wisdom has decreed for me or for others. But this does not mean, or so it seems to me, that I am to do nothing. Here in the West we have a pretty clear Rule of action laid down for us in the Parable of the Good Samaritan. It is expounded at length through the Gospels and the Epistles—if we read them for guidance. Every Saint has told us what to do. Every Eastern Scripture reveals the secret. It was summed up for me by a ragged convert at a Mission: "If you stop thinking about yourself and think about God you

will find Him a Friend; and if you think about Him you'll find the other fellow a lot better than yourself and you'll like him—you're both the Father's children."

X

"HE CANNOT HURT ME FOR HE ALWAYS HELPS ME"

> *"Calmness is now a thing to be had, to be preserved. No irritation should be let dwell inside. It is a deadly foe. Sit on all the small occasions that evoke it and the greater ones will never arise to trouble you."*—W. Q. Judge, *Letters that Have Helped Me,* Volume II, p. 85.

In seeking for the Path in its early stages it seems as if some of us walk backwards and do not know it. Others of us beginners creep and crawl, often sideways like a crab, and, it may well be, that we believe we are fairly galloping straight toward it. Some of us sleep in sloth and call our dreams action. Others of us wander off, blind to the real Trail. I have done all these things, and I suspect I have even tried hopping up and down on one leg, thinking I was making progress; wasting energy when I truly thought I was making an Effort. The point seems to be to get on the Path—few of us appreciate that. In illustration of this I have permission to tell the story of a friend of mine.

He is fortunate in being associated in his livelihood work with a remarkable man, who is at once the senior member of his firm and one of his spiritual preceptors, if I may use olden time phraseology in describing a relationship rare nowadays. But before I go further, this fortunate young man needs a name. As he talks frankly about all sorts of things about which most of us keep silent, why not let us call him Parlessimo?

Parlessimo adores his chief and yet he declares that he gives his chief endless and usually needless trouble. Inevitably, as a result of some of his many sins of omission and commission, he frequently gets "jumped on" with vigor. He blunders in preparing a brief; fails to cite his cases accurately, or even is late in appearing in court. When the head of the firm expresses most vigorously his opinions of these "messy failures," the office wonders that the usually self-important and touchy junior partner takes, what he would naturally be expected to regard as a public humiliation, so quietly and, often in such evident gratitude! One day when several of us were lunching together one of the other junior partners said to him: "Parlessimo, how do you stand the Chief's skinning you alive?"

"You dear old idiot," was the instant answer, "don't you see that he cannot hurt me for he always helps me? He has never once 'jumped me' except when I was in the wrong and deserved worse than I got. Any man less interested in me than he is would have kicked me out long ago. He is right when he 'goes for' me and he only does so because he

wants to help me. Once I used to get furiously angry when I could not see my error; then I felt hurt when I was in the dark; now when I get what you call a scolding and am blind as to the reason I am absolutely grateful to and so sorry for the chief."

. . . . . .

The puzzled look on the face of the man who asked the questions amused me, and when he left the table I said to Parlessimo—"Did you really mean that?" As he was a fellow student, I felt I could get down to actualities, now that we were alone.

"I most certainly did and do," was his reply. "The Chief is daily teaching me that one may practice occultism anywhere, everywhere. If he did not love me—yes, I use that word deliberately, for it's the only one I can use that fits the case—do you think he would give so generously of his strength to help me every chance he gets? Do you think he would take the risks of responsibility for my progress; risks on all planes, greater I know than we may appreciate? He takes the only way to make an impression on me. It is no easy task to get through the shell built around one by years of poor recollection, inattention and wrong attachment. So, you see, because I know he loves me I am sure he cannot hurt me. There is no 'malice prepense' or otherwise in him or his words, but a charity such as it takes a St. Paul to describe. From my point of view the Master uses him to help and guide me."

"Do you," I protested, "you, a grown man in the XXth Century, supposedly intelligent, believe that the Master is leading you? What would our scientific friends think of you, if they knew?

"I most certainly do mean just that, and, in the next place, I believe it can be proven that the underlying drift of what is called the scientific point-of-view is toward my position. In the third place, frankly, I don't care a button for all of what you call 'science'! Today it is only a manifestation of materialism, not real Science. Do you know anything of the way it has changed from generation to generation; swinging around the circle? Do you know how recently electricity was demonstrated by scientific men to be a substance? How long, relatively speaking, has Science admitted that the earth is round? Yet the students of Theosophy in the East have always known that and so taught it in their Mysteries, I am informed. It was a truly scientific man of the type you refer to, whose article in a British quarterly, 'proving scientifically' that a steamship could not possibly cross the Atlantic, was first brought here by the very first steamship to cross!

"So far as I have been able to determine, the only Science that has never changed in all the recorded centuries upon centuries is the science of the spiritual world as revealed by the Gods of the Ancients, the Masters of the Eastern Occultists and Western Mystics, through Chelas and through the Saints. This may be found in all the records and will

be found to be essentially the same from Lao-tsze and Pythagoras to Emerson and THE THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY. And it seems to me to be as simple as it is difficult. To advance in this great science I have only to do my work well, with joy and rejoicing; consider my fellow man and how, at the least, I may not hurt him, and, at the best, what I may do for him, not bothering over what he does to me; and worshipping my God and trying to reach the Master whose child I am; in obedience to His Will. It is simple; yet it is hard to practise. You see my great need is to put what I know to be true and right into action and effort. I want to be and become—not just to talk and feel. I have learned from those who are teaching me and from the books I am advised to read, especially from the writings of Mr. Judge and Cavé, that the training for the Path is here and now, right in my office, 'just as I am.'" Parlessimo stopped.

. . . . . .

I went back to my own work with a strengthened conception of its dignity and its spiritual possibilities. I was helped by recalling two homely but forcible illustrations. The first was used by a truly great and inspired preacher (to whom so many of us owe so great a debt) when he said at a mission service: "One does not serve Christ best by just going to church. If it be a woman's duty to wash the clothes of her husband and children she may bring joy to the heart of the Master by the spirit in which she washes them—making of the act and its perfection a sacrifice to the Master, in happy acceptance as she bends over the tub."

And again when Mr. Judge wrote, evidently to an anxious inquirer: *"Now in respect to the questions you ask, let me say that Theosophy requires no man to abandon a mode of life which is not in itself wrong. . . . As the use of meat is not an offence, so neither can be the supply of it to others, so that your assisting in killing hogs for market is in no way opposed to your duty as a man or as a Theosophist. That being your duty in present circumstances, I should recommend you to perform it without hesitation."

And from *Fragments* (p. 44) I wish to take a quotation that to me "ties together" the story of Parlessimo's chief and our need for acceptance of our opportunity to follow the Path in the circumstances in which we are now placed:

> *"Duty is not an ogre, but an angel. How few understand this. Most confuse it as they do conscience."*

SERVETUS.

* Letters That Have Helped Me. Volume II, p. 51.

PRACTICAL THEOSOPHY*

THERE are two ways in which any subject may be approached from the Theosophic point of view; or, put in other words; we may consider any subject Theosophically from two great standpoints, standpoints which run through the whole of our literature and which are called "The Head Doctrine" and "The Heart Doctrine." Their names almost explain them. The Head Doctrine considers things with the mind, the reason, the brain, from a deductive point of view. The Heart Doctrine, on the other hand, seeks to enter into the very vitals of a subject, to reach at once to its fundamental principle, to discover its spiritual essence, and to do this, not with the brain, but with the intuition. Its method is inductive. It works from generals to particulars. Any subject that I can think of may be considered from either of these standpoints, and I believe we are wise if we try to apply them both; so that this evening I propose to take up our subject first from the point of view of the Head Doctrine and then from the point of view of the Heart Doctrine.

When the Society was first founded, thirty-five years ago, the world was full of educated and cultivated people whose religious faith had been upset by the discoveries of modern science. Darwin and Huxley in evolution, Lyell in geology, many discoveries in antropology and archeology, had disproved the literal story of creation as taught by the Christian religion. People, who were full of religious sentiment and feeling, could by no means continue to believe religious teaching. Their religion had not been killed. It was only its accustomed outlet which had been destroyed. Then Theosophy, the great reconciler of science and religion, came along and was a great boon to these people. They flowed into the Society by the hundreds and thousands and found there for the first time in their lives a ground upon which they could believe in the things taught by science and at the same time continue to believe in the existence of the things of the spirit, in the life after death, in divine beings; in a word, in religion itself.

The Society was therefore a haven of refuge for this large class and once in the ranks of the Society they were enthusiastic investigators of the secrets of the universe. It was not very long, however, before these people came face to face with the fact that while Theosophy taught the undoubted existence of a spiritual plane, it also taught that this plane could not be investigated by the usual means of scientific investigation. The spiritual planes of being would not give up their secrets to the microscope or the telescope, the weights and measures, or indeed, any apparatus whatever, no matter how delicate or how efficiently wielded.

* An address delivered before the New York Branch of the T. S.

Nothing less than the human soul itself was the instrument which would enable the investigator to penetrate into the spiritual realms and discover there the underlying laws of life.

Thereupon arose an urgent and imperative demand for knowledge how so to train the soul that it could perform this most difficult task, and, ten or twelve years after the foundation of the Society we have the record of the manner in which this demand was met. "The Voice of the Silence," "Light on the Path," "Through the Gates of Gold," "Letters that have Helped Me," were all published in a few years, to be supplemented from time to time since then by a large number of articles in our many magazines which had a similar object for their being; articles, many of which have since been republished in pamphlet form, like "The Culture of Concentration." And since those early years there have been additional little books of the same general character, all dealing with the life of the soul, of the disciple; books like "Fragments" by Cavé, and Mr. Johnston's fine translations from the scriptures of the East.

A considerable proportion of the early members were attracted at once to this new aspect of affairs and ever since they have been much more interested in the devotional side of Theosophy than in its intellectual side; so that from that time we have had numerous representatives of both the Head Doctrine and the Heart Doctrine in the Society itself. This historic differentiation continues to the present day, and always will continue, for it is based upon fundamental differences in human temperament. We find the same differentiation many times in the past, the historic struggle between the supporters of "Salvation by Faith" and "Salvation by Works" being one prominent instance.

Each of these two fundamental divisions of the subject has its application to practical life, to our daily affairs. How the Head Doctrine is applied is sufficiently obvious. We have the teachings of Karma and Reincarnation, the Seven Principles of Man, Planes, Rounds and Races, all of which bear in greater or less degree upon the problem. The Head Doctrine teaches that we must be good because it pays to be good. If we are not good we shall be punished, and it shows why and how. If we are good we shall be rewarded, and again it shows how and why. This makes a very strong appeal, for Theosophy has a scientific basis for ethics. It does not teach a new ethic; but is content with the systems already in existence as now taught by any of the great religions, but it does give most convincing reasons why we should follow these moral laws, and in that it performs a great service. Christianity had as fine a system of ethics as is conceivable, perhaps, but it did not give convincing reasons why we should follow it. Theosophy does. Consequently the Head Doctrine makes a very strong appeal, and takes us very far indeed.

I should imagine that the highest possible expression of the Head Doctrine is the Golden Rule, *Do unto others as you would have others do unto you.* It is very high indeed, and the world would be a very

much more agreeable place than it is if more people followed it. At any rate I cannot see how the mind, the reason, can go farther than the Golden Rule and enunciate a law which is more elevated, or more sublime. There is, however, a higher law, but it is not easy to describe it simply because it is higher than the Head Doctrine and yet we have only the instruments of the Head Doctrine with which to discuss it. But the fact that there is such a law is apparent when we consider the Golden Rule from the standpoint of some divine being, let us take Christ, for example. We cannot imagine him being content with this rule as a guide for himself. He would, we feel, be the very first to deprecate the return which this law implies. Indeed, the very statement of the Golden Rule itself, Do unto others as you would have them do unto *you,* brings in an element of self, is expressed in terms of self, and is therefore limited to the plane of self.

There is the higher law which entirely eliminates self. Be good, not because it pays (you) to be good, but because it is right to be good; because you, in your essential inner nature, are goodness itself and should try to partake of that goodness; to bring all parts of your being into harmony with it. Theosophy, the Heart Doctrine, teaches that each soul is an offshoot of the Oversoul, a Ray of the Universal Fount of Spiritual Life; that that is what we really are, and that right conduct should have for its purpose the return to our parent source. The road thither is the killing out of self, the lower self, or, as we prefer to put it, transmuting the lower into the higher nature. And the best expression or rule for this kind of life is something Mr. Judge was very fond of saying years ago. *Never do anything for the sake of the lower self alone.* It sounds simple, but try it. Try it even for an hour!

Never do anything for the sake of the lower self alone,—there you have in words as near as words can convey, the law of the Heart Doctrine. See how it applies. If you are hungry you eat; not because you are hungry or because you like the taste of food, but because your body, a necessary instrument for your soul, needs food. You give it just the amount and the kind of food which it needs. No more, no less. That one thing alone, if followed out, would do away with at least half of all the illness in the world, which comes from over eating and improper eating. We should feed our bodies as we feed a valued horse. From experience we have found out just what is good for it, just how much is good for it, and we give it that and no more. So too with rest. We rest because we must keep the soul's instrument in good order and ready for the maximum amount of work. We sleep, to restore the dissipated energies of the soul's instrument, and we sleep as much, and no more, than is needed for this purpose.

The same applies equally to recreation and amusement. The human animal needs a certain amount of rest, recreation and amusement. Just how much depends upon temperament. Whatever amount is needed

should be supplied just as impersonally as we rest our horse. And while we are about it, let us see that we amuse ourselves conscientiously, that we do not take our pleasures sadly, as the French say the English do. There is a great power in joy. And remember that in occultism it is just as great a sin to be unjust to yourself as to another, for occultism makes no distinction between self and another; they are both but rays from the Great Central Self. Which again shows us how necessary impersonality is; we must learn to consider matters which involve ourselves just as impersonally as we do matters that do not directly concern us at all.

The other day a friend of mine told me that some men were discussing at a club the question whether it was the duty of a gentleman to get up and give his seat in a car to a lady if there were vacant seats in the car which she could take if she chose. The concensus of opinion was that it was not necessary. From the standpoint of the Golden Rule perhaps it is not, for very few of us would be so mean as to wish others to give us their seat when there were seats available for us to take if we chose. But from the standpoint of the Heart Doctrine there is no doubt at all as to the reply. If we leave out all consideration of self, if we consider only the other person, we at once give up our seat or do anything we can to help that person, without regard for our own convenience, comfort, trouble, or any other consideration whatever. It is only when we begin to bring our self into the problem that it becomes a problem and we have to try and determine what is polite or what is necessary for our own self-respect, or what is generous and kind.

You will see, therefore, that the Heart Doctrine teaches a very high code of ethics indeed, one that it will take us a very long time consistently to follow. But that is no reason why we should not make a beginning, and I therefore commend to you again what seems to me to be the best succinct expression of the moral law from the standpoint of the Heart Doctrine,—*Never do anything for the sake of the lower self alone.*

C. A. G., Jr.

WHY I JOINED THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

I

THE Editor of the QUARTERLY has asked me to state to its readers my reasons for joining the Theosophical Society. The first and fundamental reason, like all first and fundamental things, is no reason at all. I joined the Theosophical Society because I had to; because, literally, it would have been impossible for me not to do so; there was that within me which drew me to it with cosmic necessity, as iron filings are drawn to the magnet.

When I seek for purely intellectual reasons I find two main ones, under which all others may be classed as expressions or subdivisions.

1st. The Theosophical Society is the only organization in the world which is absolutely *universal,* thus incorporating in its very essence the fundamental truth of truths,—the essential unity of Life. All other religious, philosophical, or scientific bodies have some element of exclusion, some distinction of "true" and "false," in that very fact showing logically their fragmentary nature. Not so the Theosophical Society. She alone welcomes and *assimilates the mutually exclusive,* recognizing in "true" and "false" alike their relative necessity as portions of God's infinite plan for the evolution of life and humanity. Only that which is spiritual can be final, she says, and the spiritual eternally eludes mental formulation. The intellect, at its best, sees "through a glass, darkly"; therefore the distortion is part of the truth, as well as proof of intellectual perception.

This first reason,—the absolute universality of the Theosophical Society,—compels the second.

2nd. That which is eternal and universal in the present, must include in that present both past and future, else it were not eternal. Those who join the Theosophical Society in fact as well as in name,—by which I mean a making of themselves integral parts of it,—are not long in the discovery that while the outer form it wears dates back but a handful of years—to 1875—the fact remains that from all time it has existed, as it will exist in all time to come,—inevitably, as part of existence itself.

The Theosophical Society has assisted at the birth of every world and of every nation, and yet each human heart-beat can she hear; she is the mighty mother of all religions, which have all been brought forth from her bosom,—some glorious children, true to their heritage, some wayward and perverse, taking the lower paths and turning from her instruction. But all, without exception, born of her. Yet she knows

through all the aeons each individual soul, and loves it; watching and tending with unfaltering care, raising up Teachers and Guides in unbroken succession for its enlightenment.

Perceiving this, realizing this, of course I "joined"! All spaces, as all phases of thought or of emotion, were preempted by her, possessed by her. Within her embrace all portions of my being, wherever they might be, found their home. The real "joining" was the conscious recognition of the fact that she was my Mother and that I was her child.

CAVÉ.

II

I BECAME a member of the T. S. because its Constitution upholds genuine freedom, and clearly defines license as opposed to freedom.

Because it permits liberty of thought and action, and indicates the process of development through the resulting reaction.

Because it concerns itself vitally with the search for Truth, the white light of Truth, in spite of the possibility of arduous toil and the terrifying realization of "Self."

Because of the joyful recognition that everything contributes to the full development of Soul, that the whole world, and all that is in it, are just one family, with one source of Being, and one end to achieve, but with an infinite variety of processes of achievement.

So far, at least, that is what the T. S. means to a member just at the threshold, who is shy of turning about, fearing to handle any of the beautiful things within the room, but who has been warmly and fraternally invited to enter and take full possession and who hopes to become, in time, a worthy member, fit to be of service.

M. L. H.

III

MY reason for joining the Theosophical Society was that I believed the study of Theosophy would change the whole meaning of existence. Without the two doctrines of Reincarnation and Karma I saw and can still see little meaning in life, no explanation for the sorrowing and suffering of humanity, no real reason for living. With the acceptance of these doctrines a new light is thrown on the problem of existence; life becomes a thing of value, a privilege even, and "the joy of living" becomes something more than a meaningless phrase.

In order to make clear the reason why Theosophy impressed me in this particular way, it may be well to go back in some detail over several mental and spiritual crises in my life,—experiences which gradually formed the demand so fully satisfied by the Theosophical teaching.

During my childhood I passed through several periods of strong religious feeling, times when I felt intensely, though uncomprehendingly, the call of something higher than anything I then knew; at these times also, I felt vividly the nearness, if not the actual presence of God. These experiences were too intimate and too sacred to be mentioned to anyone and I kept them entirely to myself, guarding them jealously. So far as I can remember they had no effect upon my outward life and there would be little use in mentioning them now except for the fact that by the time I was fully grown, an undercurrent of religious feeling, the existence of which I scarcely realized myself, had become a part of my nature, and religious values had become my highest standard.

During four years spent in college I came into contact with a world of doubt and disbelief which stirred me deeply. My religious views at this time, were the result of a rather conventional orthodox training and they proved vulnerable on every side. Not realizing the dangers and pitfalls of a little knowledge, I began at once to apply what I learned, without waiting to get the larger meaning of the flood of new ideas which rolled in upon me. Physics, biology, psychology, metaphysics, everything, in fact, seemed either to tend toward atheism, or to be so contradictory as to confuse me utterly. In addition to my required work, I undertook to read Tolstoi's *My Religion.* This book added still another point of view to the numerous contradictions which were already overwhelming me and the result was almost disastrous. I was spiritually prostrated, groping blindly with apparently no way out of the darkness. Unwittingly I chose the worst way out, for I resolutely banished from my mind all thoughts on the subject and while this brought me calm for the time being it merely put off the struggle till another time.

One of the most important influences in my life at this time,—without doubt the influence which made it possible for me to maintain even a comparative equilibrium,—was a course of study in which I read the works of a number of the nineteenth century essayists, and took up in some detail the work and writings of John Newman and others of the leaders of the Oxford movement in the Anglican Church. Of this reading, much of which was new to me, I was profoundly affected by Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus* and Emerson's *Oversoul,* the latter essay giving me an entirely different conception of religion. In this course I found the first promise of a realization of the dreams of higher things which I had had in my childhood; it gave me a firmer grasp on my ideals and opened up to me a new life,—the inner life. This course was my real preparation for the study of Theosophy; much of the thought was not in itself theosophical, but the interpretation which we received was distinctly theosophical. At that time I was not yet ready for the teaching and could grasp but dimly the significance of it; nevertheless it was then that the seed was sown which made it possible later on for me to make the truth my own.

After leaving college I came to New York and took up social work.

All day and sometimes far into the night I worked among the homeless and miserable, the suffering and the sorrowing. During some months of this work I lived directly opposite the Municipal Home where every night several hundred men and women, wretched outcasts of humanity, came for a meal and a night's lodging. At a late hour each night those whom the place could not accommodate were turned away, to take refuge in the Randall's Island police boat and return at dawn for their cup of coffee. Night after night, during one of the coldest winters on record, I listened to the shuffling of their ill-shod feet and heard their harsh voices, as they fought and struggled for first place.

It was the first time that I had come face to face with human suffering, with the real tragedy of life, and I was appalled by the awfulness of it. I lost sight of everything but the utter injustice of human, man-made institutions and the apparent injustice of the ruling of the universe. What difference was there fundamentally between me and the poor wretches in the street. Why was I warm and comfortable, possessed of blessings without number, while men, women and even little children fought in the cold and darkness for food and shelter for a single night. By what possible conception of justice could man be brought into being through no volition of his own, placed in an environment beyond his power to change, forced to live out an existence often worse than hell and then pass into "the unknown." Once again I was groping in darkness. If everyone had an equal chance in life, if the brotherhood of man which Christ had taught were something more than a mere phrase, then religion might be practicable,—religion and daily life might go hand in hand. What place was there, however, for a religion such as mine under the existing condition of things?

Several of my friends had had similar experiences, had lost all faith in their former religious beliefs and had found considerable satisfaction in socialism. In many ways socialism did seem to be the solution of the problem; in actual argument it always won out, for matters of faith, particularly a weak and shaken faith such as mine, I could never argue satisfactorily. Nevertheless, socialism offered no *immediate* remedy, its ideal state seemed too hypothetical,—a matter of an altogether too remote future to be satisfying. Then, too, its principle of brotherhood seemed too largely political to be thoroughly satisfactory. The ideal socialistic state, it seemed to me, would be like a great machine, admirably put together, and possessing perhaps the dynamic force to make it run; but there would still be lacking the oil to make it run smoothly. That oil would be something deeper or perhaps it is better to say something higher than anything that I had found in socialistic doctrines.

My early training and the several outbursts of real religious feeling which I had experienced remained too vividly in my memory for me to lose my faith entirely; I clung to my religious beliefs, to a certain extent satisfying myself with the thought that injustice in the part need not necessarily work out for injustice in the whole. I *knew* that God existed

—nevertheless I was utterly unable to make any reconciliation between my life and my religion. They remained distinct and apart and I buried myself in the problems of the one or turned to the other for the moment, blindly and without either understanding or satisfaction.

In this state of mind, I read Mr. Johnston's translation of the *Bhagavad Gita*. I had read the book before but had not been ready for its message. This time I was impressed by an entirely different aspect of its teaching,—the doctrines of Karma and Reincarnation. As a possibility of belief in the present day they were new to me, yet they took as firm a hold upon me as though I had always known them, like a truth learned long before and suddenly recalled to mind. I perceived that they afforded the explanation I had been seeking, that they were the one possible way out of my doubts and difficulties; through them life might come to mean light instead of darkness, hope and joy instead of despair. In my search for further literature on the subject I found that Theosophy embraced both these doctrines.

It was about this time that I first had the privilege of coming into contact with the work and the workers in a mission in one of the congested districts of the city. Here I found a satisfaction which I had not experienced before, for the place was filled with that spiritual uplift which naturally accompanies the endeavor really to live the Christian teaching, to work into one's life the true spirit of Christ. Shortly afterward I was invited to attend a meeting of the T. S., and in doing so met again the same people whom I had found active in the work of the mission. As it happened the subject for discussion that night dealt with the relation between Theosophy and Christianity, and here it seemed that the last of my former difficulties were taken away. The theosophical teaching filled life with a new significance, it made possible to me the religion which my nature had come to demand, and it opened up, and promised a realization of higher and nobler ideals than any I had yet known. The promise of *realization* appealed to me more strongly perhaps than anything else. Theosophy was not a mere theory, a beautiful vision, I had already seen proof to the contrary in the work of certain members of the society who were endeavoring to put the teaching into actual practice, to show forth in their lives something of its truth and beauty.

Certainly the answer to my questionings had been found. And that answer was a veritable call to arms, energizing, uplifting, inspiring; a call which brooked neither delay nor refusal, but demanded at once the endeavor to lead the largest, fullest and most active life that one is capable of living.

J.

ON THE SCREEN OF TIME

Practical Occultism

II

THE last of Cavé's comments on the record of Mrs. S., quoted by me in the July issue of the Quarterly, was on an entry dated January 31, 1904. On February 1st, Mrs. S. wrote: "The earlier part of the day having been rushed and mentally undisciplined [she was still travelling with her husband in Japan], I tried hard to regain quietude during this meditation, and more or less succeeded. Toward the end of the ten minutes, a text came into my mind which I am not conscious of having thought of before, and which, though I noted it down at once, I could not remember at 10 P. M.: 'Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled.' And I connected this in some way with Cavé."

On this it was commented: "It was your translation of the message I sent you for the day before." The significance of this, of course, lies in the word "translation," for the untrained mind, even when correctly receiving an idea, often clothes it in words of its own, or in texts or phrases long since lost to surface memory.

The next entry did not elicit comment, and I quote it only because it will rouse a responsive echo in the experience of many of my readers. "This was a very unsatisfactory meditation. I became possessed with sleepiness as soon as I began, and, try as I would, I failed to shake it off. It was more an effort to keep awake than anything else; and I have no other impressions to note. There were reasons—but no excuse."

On February 7th I find: "This was a splendid meditation in feeling, and the peace and hope of it are still with me after several minutes' interlude. Yet it was not so much hope at the time, as realization—imperfect and incomplete, yet vivid. When it was all over, a mental echo which took the form, 'Hold fast and pursue your way,' with the emphasis on 'pursue.'"

On this the comment was: "These are the notes I best like: they are much more direct—less mental."

There are several entries without comment. Then, on the 15th: "This, as a meditation, was fair. There was sense of co-operation, but not vivid. I extended it for the half hour, but it did not improve. The five o'clock ten minutes and also seven, were noticeably good. Can it be that the four o'clock 'gets through' later?"

Cavé commented: "This happens often when the mind in some way is not really attuned."

Next day Mrs. S. writes: "I had been preparing for this for several minutes beforehand by reading *The Oratory of the Faithful Soul*

by Blosius. Whether for this reason or for some other, the meditation itself was far better than usual. . . . I notice a change in these meditations. Instead of their dominant note being peace and joy, it has become an intense longing which is really a pain. I try to convert this into realization by dwelling on the Higher Self as myself; but even then, I find *that* self reflecting [!] the same longing—in this case to be, somehow, the embodiment of the Master. I felt also as if Cavé and I and others were actually in the presence of the Master."

On the 18th: "This I entirely forgot, to my shame, as I had reminded myself of it several times in advance. I was putting off in a small boat from the steamer."

On the 22d: "The sense of Cavé's co-operation was very clear and was very helpful. My mind had been immersed in letters up to the last moment. A distinct effort to 'Look, see, and love'—as if being urged and helped to do this. Yet no result, except the *thought* of the Master with outstretched arms."

"And the result of this was," runs the comment, "that the Master *was* before you with outstretched arms, and that your mind only *thought* it (all your *mind* can do!). Had you been above the mind, you would have seen the Master, or at least had a vision of Him, and seen the thought, looking down in your mind, and so have kept them both straight. Does this give you some better idea of how it is done?"

On the following day, Mrs. S. made this entry: "When the meditation was over, I had it in my mind to write 'Quiet and steady, with a sense of myself in some inner and ideal way. But curiously lacking in any recognition or perception of Cavé's co-operation.' Then I continued for a few moments longer, to recover the feeling of myself as that spiritual being—free and sure of touch, selfless and glad, *reflecting,* as it seemed, some of these qualities of the Master. And then it dawned upon me that this impression and semi-realization (with apparent absence of Cavé) were the result of Cavé's thinking of me in just that way. Cavé's 'projection,' I called it at first: but why not 'vision'?"

Cavé wrote: "Thinking of you as you really are is, it seems to me, a way of helping you to realize what you really are. That is why I so much want you to have these impressions."

A day or two later Mrs. S. added a question to her record: "This was in a jinrikisha, driving to Hotel from station. There was much sense of force; and it almost amounted to a meditation in spite of distractions. Would it be better, in a case of this sort, *not* to try to meditate, but to be content with 'prayers of direct affection' or with 'acts'?"

The note to this reads: "When you cannot meditate because of mental distractions, *pray* by all means, but I would not say 'not to try to meditate'; because I would keep the idea, the desire for meditation in the back part of my consciousness, realizing that the prayers are a means to this end (which, in fact, we should always try to do in prayer). My idea of prayer, personally, is conversation with the Master—very intimate,

adoring conversation, which leads to communion with him: an interchange, and then a sense of union. When self-consciousness is lost in the union, that is the highest stage I know. —u —l tells me that Communion is one of the things I seem to understand about: so I think this is not misleading."

It is difficult to tell when Mrs. S. received the letters which Cavé wrote to her, but I can in any case give the dates on which they were written. A brief note on Christmas Eve: "I am thinking many thoughts your way tonight, and trying to keep the wonderful hush and darkness of Christmas Eve in my heart, in the midst of all the glare and noise about us. May you find its peace, and thus the divine Light of Christmas."

January 27th: ". . . It is the old, old lesson which we need so much to learn: to have patience, to wait. Some day I shall learn that lesson—even the little brother's grave eyes promise me that, and —u —l never lets me voice the least doubt of it. . . . We cannot ask for easier circumstances in which to accomplish our purposes: the test of success will be, can we accomplish it in *these?* And something in the depths of me stirs when I think of that, crying 'Yes, it shall be done, in the hardest; and so, greater force, greater momentum.' What can the Dark Powers do against the Soul that has faced *all odds*—and won! And I know that no less sure victory than this would ever satisfy me."

A week or so later Cavé wrote: "My very dear friend, I cannot let another mail go without sending you a line. I had intended a letter, but all day I have been rushed, and now there remains but a brief moment in which to write. I must trust your understanding; your indulgence I can trust, but what I want you to know and believe is that I want to write: it is no task of friendship and courtesy that impels me, but the very deep and genuine desire to have you know something of what lies so truly and so steadfastly in my mind and heart. First then I thank you for your beautiful and most kind letter. What you tell me in it must indeed make me glad, even through the great sense of unworthiness which humbles me. These are the things in life which make life truly worth while, and make its sorrows and burdens easy, and are ample compensation for its pains. I am going to tell you simply and frankly that when you went away and left us, was one of the very great pains of my life, but that I always was determined you should come back and that I would never, never surrender that determination: that somehow, some way you must come back—I would make you—and I realized that the first thing I must learn for that was patience, to wait the time and opportunity, and the tented faith that would not waver meanwhile. I hope you do not mind my saying this, for by saying it you will have a better appreciation of the great joy you have given me—what it really means to me to have so much reward; and I hope you will not mind my feeling it to be a reward. After all, we belong together in this work, in its wonderful tie of Brotherhood, and to the same Master. . . . Way in the back part of Judge's mind was the possibility of just the work

we shall be trying to do during our remaining years of life, though he never spoke to me of it in detail, only warning me always to be 'ready' and to 'miss nothing,' and to keep my 'eyes open,' and sometimes testing me with questions and problems which at the moment I only half understood, but later understood so well! But though he never spoke, it was from him I learned it, in that wonderful way in which one learns through association and love, with a great soul like his. And so, dear friend, as long ago, not knowing, you brought the pain, so today you bring a great joy and reward, and I am deeply grateful to *you,* and pray the Master's blessing may be upon you for it."

The next letter from Cavé was written after receiving from Mrs. S. the records already quoted and still further entries which I shall give after the letter, so as to enable the reader to follow the extent to which Mrs. S. succeeded in registering in her personal consciousness the help she was given.

"Your note books I have gone over carefully. I am glad you have let me see them, for it helps me, and I believe will help you. . . . Three things I have tried to impress—not mentally, but into your inmost nature. First, *love of the Master,* opening out of your heart to him. You have great powers of loving, but they are like a frozen Niagara—frozen by your mind. Second, *true self-confidence,* not the false kind of the past, which you have now learned can snap under you, but the kind shadowed forth in St. Paul's expression of a life hid with Christ in God. Third, *to forge ahead,* which means that making haste slowly which is the only haste the Master knows. Have you ever watched a great snow plough going through a drift in advance of a train? That is to my mind a picture of the will.

"So there is a trinity of effort, a noble *three*-fold path, and like all genuine trinities, a unity, for each one is an aspect of the first, the Love of the Master, which alone makes the others exist, or possible of realization. This explanation may aid you in getting a certain coherence out of your meditations: but I wanted you to work at it unaided first, for you must do it from the *inside* now. Do it with your *heart:* you have a fatal facility for doing it with your head!"

Returning now to the records of Mrs. S.—and those that follow were written before she could have received the letter just quoted—I find that on February 27th she entered: "This was only a fair meditation—perhaps not even that, as I felt dull and heavy with cold and quinine. Yet there was a sense, as before, of the ideal self being visualized for me, so that identification with the 'Warrior' came nearer."

Next day: "Clearly, this sense of identification is the point trying to be worked into my consciousness. It has been much in my mind at other times also, not only as something to try for, but as a criticism of the accepted Christian method. Today, in addition, there was an urging to 'look and see': and I tried, but in spite of being pushed at it, there was no result."

On this Cavé commented: "Of course until you have had some vision of yourself as the disciple, you will find it most difficult to blend it and the personality. And this can only be done (I mean the having of this vision) in the light of the Higher Self, for we only see the disciple in true proportion and colour in that light. All mental images are distortions more or less, as is a picture reflected in even the clearest pool."

On the following day: "This was not a success from any point of view. And I had prepared for it, too. It was stale. Nothing vivid about it."

The comment here is: "Perhaps too much preparation, which sometimes may mean too much mind *on,* and therefore *in* it."

On March 3d, Mrs. S. wrote: "This was more abstract than usual, influenced, perhaps, by re-reading some of the Persian mystics—which aroused in me the old desire for 'formlessness,' and even the old longing for it—'where all hearts are one.' But it was not otherwise noteworthy. (This afternoon, or yesterday, the image of ourselves as prisoners longing to escape)."

On this it was commented: "The desire for formlessness had nothing in itself of wrong. It springs from a depth of fundamental reality within us. But we must not *leap* for it: that is only to come back and do properly what otherwise is really not done at all. Nor must there be any shade of revolt. There could be no genuine formlessness without complete resignation of will and desire, and so the world of form, in all its planes, is to be accepted, as every other condition must be accepted. How can we ever expect to impress the modern socialist, for instance, with the need of rising above the idea of material conditions, until we, with fine comprehension, accept serenely the conditions of personality, mental barriers, emotional obscurations! This is a *practical* view of the matter, the inner aspect of which is that what is usually called 'seeking after formlessness'—even in would-be disciples—is a turning back from that which they seek, instead of a working towards it. These matters are all questions of growth, and we must accept, joyfully and gratefully, our means of growing. Not only the soil and climate the Master has provided for us particularly, but those general laws of soil and climate and gardening which the Great Master of the universe in His unspeakable Wisdom has ordained. Forcing may often produce wonderful flowers. But in —u —l's lily garden we shall learn that the bulb dies. . . . Then, as to 'longing to escape,' have you ever had a wonderful thought that has given me hours of ecstasy,—of Christ as a prisoner in the Tabernacle of our hearts?"

Next day Mrs. S. wrote: "Again that longing for 'formlessness,' where all consciousness is one, where all hearts are one: and I think it helps at certain times as nothing else does, though, to some extent, it seems to eliminate the usual sense of co-operation."

And Cavé: "Since in the dangerously imperfect manner in which we

grasp it, it involves the great heresy of Separateness. The paradoxes of *Light on the Path* work *down* as well as *up.*"

On March 7th: "I asked on what I should meditate and how, and prayed that I might be helped. The answer was that I should meditate on that being which the Master wishes me to become, and on which he meditates when he thinks of me in that way. [In a marginal note Cavé wrote, "This is wise."] First to think of that being, and then, having thought of it as 'that,' to try to feel it as 'this.' I tried, but not with much success. *Looking* for something that Cavé might have to say, it seemed to be 'Turn your heart, and keep it turned.'"

On the 9th: "Very dry, and difficult to get anywhere. The mind not so much active as 'sticky.' The usual sense of outside help lacking."

The comment reads: "When the mind is 'sticky,' it has some admixture of emotional glue."

On the 25th Mrs. S. wrote: "This was one of the worst meditations I have ever perpetrated. There was noise both outside and in. My mind would not keep quiet, commenting on the failure of the meditation with intentions for the future. I frankly gave up trying to meditate, as such, and tried to talk in my mind to Cavé, saying how deeply I desire to serve Cavé, and then asking the Master to help me to respond to Cavé's efforts on my behalf. Then I made a draft entry of this, and I tried to accept the failure of it—which I find very difficult. I have, I believe, a fairly good mental idea of how it ought to be done; I have an intense desire to do it, and a longing for 'the fruits of meditation.' Then this utter inability to do, while it does not shake the determination to go on trying, or belief, even, in ultimate success (because I have done much better)—fills me with a sort of disgust of myself which is difficult to overcome. Look at it as I may, it *is* disgusting.

[A marginal note by Cavé: "Oh! no—not 'disgusting' at all. If you had true humility you would not even be surprised."]

The record by Mrs. S. goes right on: "The bad habits, or lack of mental discipline, of twenty years; the having to do things now, which I ought to have done when I first joined the ——. (Later.) I stopped my entry at that point for ten more minutes of meditation. It seemed as if someone came along and—not for the first time—tightened the ether in my brain in an effort to stop the ordinary mental activity, and at the same time filled my heart with so great a longing for the Master that I thought it *must* break through. Yet nothing 'happened': and there was enough mentality left to note at intervals what was going on—not from above, but from below.

"(Next morning). It dawns upon me this morning: Be content to give what you have in each minute. I had prayed that love for Him would become a ravening hunger, so great as to push out every other thought or feeling. But I suspect now that that was a mistake, or was in any case something to be transformed into the sole desire to give, and

that I must learn to be content to give just what I have, no matter how little that may be."

Cavé commented: "Yes—just pour yourself out. As we pour out, little by little, He fills. So the quality improves."

Mrs. S. told me that she was writing frequently to Cavé at this time, and that, although she had forgotten the exact nature of the letters which evoked the following replies, she remembered that she had been worried about an unexpected and increasing tendency to feel "emotional."

There is a letter from Cavé written early in March: "Your emotional nature is not what you need be afraid of. *Trust yourself.* Fear rather the coldness which freezes your spontaneity and natural warmth, and makes a thin coating of frost between you and others and every other influence. Do not hold yourself in: let yourself out. I want you to melt, to thaw, to expand, to bask in the sunshine yourself and to let others bask in yours. If some one be so mistaken as to take advantage of it, forgive them in the Master's name, even as he forgives all the advantage we take of him, since he will bear anything for the sake of love. I ask hard things of you, but oh! the rewards. . . . And you must be happy, too; you must *cultivate* it. Joy is the fruit of love, and you have had your vision of love—of what the Master's love can be."

Some time afterwards Cavé wrote: "I want to make some notes on your last letter. Your way of being happy ('I just sit quietly and silently and *am* happy') is a very good way. I could not suggest anything to improve it. That is to bask in the sunshine and to bring sunshine to others; for you will radiate it, fill the atmosphere with it. What I want is that you should feel that way *oftener,* until after a while you feel so *continuously;* and I want you to let me help you to feel so. The Master's disciple should be the most joyous of creatures in the depths of his consciousness. I want your aura to be radiant with colour and not so grey.

"When I wrote of taking advantage, I was thinking of what you had said about familiarity. I sympathize so warmly with your feeling about that. I detest it, for it cheapens everything. Close intimacy with those I love is something I prize and desire: and to my thought familiarity deprives intimacy of all charm and meaning—almost vulgarizes it. Very few people indeed seem to appreciate this. They tarnish and bruise with rude touches the most beautiful flowers of life, and then mourn that their bouquet is scentless and faded. But it is ignorance—lack of perception and understanding—and one must accept a certain amount of it with patience and sweetness. To forbid oneself expansion to avoid it, were to commit the graver error; for so long as one does not descend to the level of familiarity oneself, one is not contaminated by it, and by keeping always one's own true sense of value, one can preserve fresh and pure the precious fragrance of intimate affection and intercourse. It is one of the lessons we have to learn—an essential lesson in discipleship, where the disciples must become as the fingers of one hand.

"And how right you are about *reverence*. What is love without it! For no matter how dear the personality may be (and no one realizes that more keenly than I to whom absence is such a bitter pain), yet any one even half awake comprehends that the true bond, the real object of our affection, lies deeper than that, and that we are really one in the Master's love, for us and in us, and each to each must make obeisance 'to the dim star that burns within.' 'Steadily as we watch and worship, its light will grow stronger'—one of the highest services of love. How could all this be without the deepest reverence? Still the eternal paradox of all human life and endeavour is here also, and this deepest reverence is in no wise incompatible with—nay, is at the very heart of, the closest intimacy—and both should be. You know as well as I that one of the gravest American defects is lack of reverence. That they have it, deep hidden in their natures somewhere, is shown by their magnificent chivalry to their women,—but in their manners! . . . Do not be disturbed over your longing for silence. Ours is the Lodge of Silence, and that longing is the nostalgia of the Lodge. A certain amount of silence we *need:* the rest we must train ourselves to relinquish with sweetness, for there is no value in the renunciation which is not made sweetly."

Other letters and other records with comment, must be held over until the next QUARTERLY. T.

"Obedience opens the door of Heaven."

ALCUIN.

ELEMENTARY ARTICLE

Theosophy and the Family

ONE who first contemplates Theosophy must necessarily consider what effect allegiance to it would have upon his relations with and his duties to others, more particularly to his own immediate family. Is there occasion to fear that he may find himself, as a follower of Theosophy, cut off from his family, segregated, set aside and left self-centered? There are people who would consider this the natural result; but to those who have read even the earliest books, have received the most elementary instruction, this seems an extraordinary viewpoint. How can it exist?

Take the Theosophical Society, that great present-day exponent of Theosophy; that latest outer manifestation of the Great Movement that started before History exists; further back than History itself dare conceive—What does the T. S. teach? Again and again it has been said that the T. S. has no dogmas, no platform which must be accepted as a preliminary—save and excepting one: tolerance.

Now, true tolerance does not mean a passive, negative, do-nothing attitude. That savors of pitying contempt and no form of contempt may even be fancied as tolerant. How, then, may we apply tolerance to the relations with the family. This ought to be easy, for in every action in our daily lives we ask, expect, even demand tolerance from our families. We who thus expect it for our own benefit, we understand it perfectly. But we have to learn to practice it for others as well as to enjoy its fruits for ourselves. If our budding interest in matters Theosophical offends a member of our family we must recognize that we become dogmatic and intolerant the moment we persist in conversation, even though it be on topics that to us are high and holy. We should consider others, not ourselves, and practice the great occult power of silence.

"Is it not our duty to proclaim our faith? Is it not cowardly to be silent?" These questions are the excuses of the beginner, but like most excuses they are at the bottom untrue. Certainly we should proclaim our faith, not in mere words but in action; for do not "actions speak louder than words"? It is cowardly to be silent, in the real meaning of silence. But we are not "silent" when we let the Real Man do the talking. Remember, however, his talking will be "heard" only as we act.

Most of us know little about this inner or "Real Man," but there are others, the great Teachers, Saints and Mystics of all time, who know and who have tried to teach us. "The good in us is always kind" is a phrase that comes with the strength of a quotation: it is certainly a fact. Suppose, for the moment, we call the "Real Man" that "Good" in us which is always kind. What is the kind thing to do? Try reversing positions: Suppose that, while you want to talk what you call Theosophy, Tom wants to talk batting averages or Dick politics or Harry about people. Of course you do not like it and you may even be hurt at their lack of interest in your topic, but if you are truly tolerant you will listen to them with the same interest that you want from them and will avoid the intolerance of even feeling bored or superior. That is, you will apply to this particular case that marvelous summing up of the Law by the great Western Master in what we know as the Golden Rule—a Rule taught by each and every Teacher of Whom we have record.

So we must be tolerant—not weakly tolerant but actively tolerant, and in the T. S. this tolerance is directed toward high ends. The very first object of the Society is "to be the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste or color." Note the practicability of that—no impossible "aim and object," but a humble, possible beginning "to form the nucleus." Each of us may be a nucleus and the way to become one is easy, for we may begin by being kind—not to ourselves but to others. True kindness is never selfish. "Brotherhood" with distant peoples, with masses of other lives, will be unobtainable if we can not begin by being Brothers to those nearest us. If we cannot be tolerant, be kind to a father, mother, wife or child, how can we expect to be so to strangers? "The best manners begin at home" is a homely saying but a true one and, like many a proverb which has survived, contains occult truth.

As we progress we shall find that there are increasing reasons for putting the family first, for the faithful performance of all family duties. While there are no Theosophical dogmas or partizan principles (as with a political party) we find certain matters on which the great Theosophical Teachers agree, whether they come from the East or from the West. God or Karma or Fate has put us where we can get the utmost out of the Lesson of Life. If we are put into a family we ought to get the most out of it by giving to that family the utmost kindness and love of which we are capable. Who are the men we follow and admire most? Are they not the men whose lives and actions come the nearest to our ideals? If we *live* Theosophy will not that fact draw others to it, others whom our words might repel? Why not trust the Powers That Be a little more! Perhaps the reality of our progress in Theosophy, the truth as to our interest in it, will be tested by our consideration for others, especially those others to whom our circumstances bring us nearest and closest.

Another point of agreement which we shall find in all the teaching is that Theosophy is a Life, a Way, not a belief. One may believe almost

anything and still be a true follower of Theosophy if one lives Theosophically. It would seem, therefore, that it will not be enough to be silent in true tolerance, kind in self-control as a member of a family, but that we must go further. Silence and such kindness become negative the minute one truly feels the call of Theosophy, for that is a call to action, to a Life, to the Way.

"Good theory," someone may say, "but what about the facts? My brother actually knows of a family that was broken up because of Theosophy." Unfortunately families seem to split very readily under our present form of civilization, but do you really think that kindness, love, tolerance, genuine understanding, respect for the individual, desire to serve first the interests of all, would prove disruptive forces in a family? Theosophy taken into the family as a philosophy may not always make for harmony, but Theosophy really lived brings a light and joy that no family would choose to cast out. Nor is there any place in it for "superiority" towards the beliefs, the feelings, the experiences of others. He has little understood the teaching of Karma who can turn away from a brother's misfortune, unmoved, with the reflection that the other is only reaping what he has sowed: when Karma sent the affliction, did it not also, and equally, place him, the would-be Theosophist, at that very spot with an opportunity to help that brother?

As was pointed out at the recent Annual Convention of the Theosophical Society, much masquerades under the names Theosophical and T. S., which is most untheosophical. Many a man, and more than one nation, calling themselves Christian or Buddhist, have done things which are absolutely contrary to all the teaching and the very life of the Christ and the Buddha.

If Theosophy be a life and the T. S. a means of finding how to live it, we need not alarm ourselves because miscalled "Theosophy" has brought hate into homes and separated members of a family—all we have to do is to prove our fitness for becoming real Theosophists by making our families love us the more for the greater love and tenderness by which we may manifest Theosophy in our own lives—"here and now."

G. M. MacKlemn.

REVIEWS

Theosophisches Leben. This old friend comes to us in a new dress. But the new dress is one long familiar to our eyes. So there is no shock such as a change often brings. *Theosophisches Leben,* the magazine which Mr. Paul Raatz has for many years sent out month by month, is now to appear quarterly. And to signalise this step, a cover design similar to that of the THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY is used. It is very pleasing. Heretofore my year has been marked not by the secular months but by four quarters. The appearance of each issue of the QUARTERLY has been the chief event of the season and my great delight. Now there will be two such advents—two Quarterlies lying together on the table, arousing all my curiosity and desire, and requiring all the firmness I can muster to keep me patiently at my tasks, until I can, without violating conscience, turn over the leaves I love. The familiar words about the objects of the Society are printed on the last page of the cover; the clear strong type stands out on excellent paper; and one is very happy to turn over page after page, finding things new and old.

Many of the articles are original contributions—an interesting study of Madame Blavatsky and Nietzsche by Oscar Stoll, and a helpful essay by Paul Raatz on Nicholas, a fifteenth century mystic. Then there are articles reprinted from *Lucifer* and from the THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY. A single impression is given by both series of contributions—original and reprints. That impression is one of faithfulness to the spirit of H. P. B., of loyalty to her teachings. And this loyal devotion to H. P. B., is shown by reverence for her actual writings, and by the performance of a difficult task—the adaptation of her teaching to the needs of the present hour.

It is safe to postulate of all great teachers, I think, that their most fervent desire would be to leave behind them a group of followers united by the life principle into an organism. Such an organism would develop as all other live things do. It would undergo natural changes. It would find itself, at later periods, fitted to undertake labors that were impossible in the stage of infancy. It would discover in time its splendid creative faculty, and use it. Yet how many leaders have succeeded in bringing their followers together into such a real association? St. Francis, before his death, wept with disappointment over the failure of his purposes. The man who succeeded Ignatius Loyola practically wrecked the Society of Jesus. What happens is usually the same in all cases. Those who have gathered around the leader have not been kindled by the flame of his spirit. They worship the dead letter of his words. The result is inevitable. Instead of an organism active and creative, there is a piece of mechanism that stupidly grinds out, century after century, hollow, deadening words. Madame Blavatsky had of course to face such contingent danger. Would her mission prove a success or not? Would the Theosophical Society prove a vital and virile thing, or would it be a machine turning always the same leather belts? A sufficient answer to the question is given by the present number of *Theosophisches Leben.* We congratulate the members of the German Branches upon the flame of the founder's spirit that manifests itself in this new quarterly issue. They have been able to adapt H. P. B.'s

ideas to the need of the hour—to the needs of humanity in the Western world, of which, at this hour, the T. S. would seem to be in a special manner the spiritual organ. Surely the greatest need of the prosperous Western world today is religion, its own religion revivified and rejuvenated by the splendid vitality of the theosophical method and life. *Theosophisches Leben* recognises that need and endeavors to fulfil the purpose of the Society—the service of humanity. Many articles and quotations give glimpses into the real significance of the Christian teaching.

Nicholas of Bâle

I cannot close this notice of *Theosophisches Leben,* without comment upon the very interesting account of Nicholas of Bâle in the July number. I have often heard of Nicholas of Bâle. But what I have heard has represented him as a mysterious person of whom little was known. I am going to give a bald outline of this article and trust that some one will be led to become acquainted with the article itself. Nicholas had a boyhood much like that of St. Francis. He was the son of a rich merchant, who was ambitious for his son's worldly success. The night before his bethrothal, Nicholas prayed before a crucifix that he might in all things do the Master's will. The Figure on the Cross responded to that prayer and told Nicholas he was to lead a religious life. When he narrated this incident to his lady, she accepted it, and said that she, too, would consecrate herself to the service of Christ. For a time he subjected his body to very severe chastisement, but was told in a dream that that extreme discipline had been suggested to him by the Devil. He received frequent visits from two Beings whom he called St. Catherine and St. Agnes. But he was in a condition to receive inward teaching also, and was thus, inwardly, told that within five months he would understand the Scriptures, and be able to expound them as well as if he had devoted his whole life to their study. Then followed a period of great dryness. Like St. John of the Cross he had to pass through a "Dark Night of the Soul." But afterwards he was able to see that even this dryness was a gift from God's love. Nicholas was a potent influence upon many illustrious men of his century. The most striking example of this is his relation with the famous Dominican preacher, Tauler. Tauler was a man of good will who had developed his mental faculties at the expense of his spiritual. Nicholas established an intimacy with him through attending his sermons. Then when Tauler had been brought to look upon Nicholas somewhat as a son, Nicholas astounded him by very clearly pointing out faults that needed amendment. The result was that Tauler in turn made himself a disciple of Nicholas, and after two years of severe training in seclusion returned to preaching under the direction of his adviser.

There were several circles of friends and disciples gathered around Nicholas, according to the degree of advancement in discipleship. His innermost circle numbered five. With these five friends, he built a hut in the mountains where they might pray in intercession for the sins of the world. But when the wickedness of the world seemed constantly increasing, the five friends decided to leave their mountain altar, and go out into the world to preach. Nicholas went to Vienna, and there was arrested and burned. Various charges were brought against him, but the most serious was that he, a layman, had presumed to direct and exact obedience from ecclesiastics.

Alfred Williston.

Gitanjali (*Song Offerings*), by Rabindranath Tagore (Macmillan & Co.). A rendering into exquisite English prose, by the author himself, of his original Bengali poems. They are true poetry, the beautiful expression of the joy of the soul, of its longing and adoration. Other poets have sung the joy of life and many have voiced the yearning of the soul, but few have reached to the harmony

of the two, the yearning unembittered by doubt, the joy untouched by shadow of fear. It is the joy that the soul finds when it finds itself, when it knows its purpose and consciously seeks discipleship. Then:

"All that is harsh and dissonant in my life melts into one sweet harmony—and my adoration spreads wings like a glad bird on its flight across the sea." (Page 2.)

. . . . . .

The following extracts give a very inadequate idea of the feeling and beauty of the poems:

"Only there is the agony of wishing in my heart. The blossom has not opened; only the wind is sighing by.

"I have not seen his face, nor have I listened to his voice; only I have heard his gentle footsteps from the road before my house." (Page 11.)

. . . . . .

"This is my delight, thus to wait and watch at the wayside where shadow chases light and the rain comes in the wake of the summer.

"Messengers, with tidings from unknown skies, greet me and speed along the road. My heart is glad within, and the breath of the passing breeze is sweet.

"From dawn till dusk I sit here before my door, and I know that of a sudden the happy moment will arrive when I shall see.

"In the meantime I smile and I sing all alone. In the meantime the air is filling with the perfume of promise." (Page 36.)

All who have tried to meditate will appreciate this:

"I came out alone on my way to my tryst. But who is this that follows me in the silent dark?

"I move aside to avoid his presence, but I escape him not.

"He makes the dust rise from the earth with his swagger; he adds his loud voice to every word that I utter.

"He is my own little self, my lord, he knows no shame; but I am ashamed to come to thy door in his company."

The unity of the universe with the striking idea that he who loves life must, therefore, love death as well, is beautifully brought out in the following:

"I was not aware of the moment when I first crossed the threshold of this life.

"What was the power that made me open out into this vast mystery like a bud in the forest at midnight.

"When in the morning I looked upon the light I felt in a moment that I was no stranger in this world, that the inscrutable without name and form had taken me in its arms in the form of my own mother.

"Even so, in death the same unknown will appear as ever known to me. And because I love this life, I know I shall love death as well.

"The child cries out when from the right breast the mother takes it away, in the very next moment to find in the left one its consolation." J. M.

Dante and the Mystics, by Edmund G. Gardner. Christian philosophy crystallized into such hard and indissoluble dogmas in the writings of many theologians that we welcome any book that shows us Christian truth still fluid and fiery with the touch of the Spirit. Mr. Gardner's book makes it quite clear that for several centuries, from the year 1000 on, personal experience and not dogma was the common element of religion. Personal experience of religion is almost his definition of mysticism. "A mystic," he writes, "is one who conceives of religion as an experience of eternity." Theologians like Aquinas and Augustine, who, in some quarters, are known only as hard dogmatists, are presented in this volume as "sheer mystics." Such a presentation may dispel from many minds prejudices that are

not altogether ineradicable. Thomas Aquinas as representative of scholastic philosophy, is too often thought of as the father of the crudest errors of Roman Catholicism—the popular notion of transubstantiation for example. Whereas his true explanation of the Sacrament is profoundly philosophical, and altogether in accord with the most characteristic teachings of Vedantin sages. What Aquinas really taught is that every material object is a veil of the Spiritual and Eternal. The passage *through* the veil, from the temporal to the Eternal, is Transubstantiation, *i. e.,* a transfer of consciousness from the unreal world of appearance to the immortal realm of true Substance, Divine Essence.

There is much of value in the book, and one regrets that its form seems likely not to take it to many readers. The book is made up of university lectures, and it is academic. It treats of Mysticism and the Mystics as a subject for intellectual study, analysis, comparison, etc. Passages from Dante and other writers are paralleled to show what is common to them. The author is a scholar and has stores of knowledge. But, like many scholars, he does not get inside the shell of things. He has no goal in view to which his interesting comparisons lead.

CLARENCE C. CLARK.

The Master, by J. Todd Ferrier. This book promises, on its title page, to communicate to the reader information about the Master, Jesus Christ, which is not obtainable from the Gospel narratives. This information came to the author, the title page states, through Illuminations, Visions, Experiences. There is something repellent about the title page. But, one starts to read, mindful of some of the revelations made to Saints as they meditated upon the Life and Passion of our Lord (especially of the disclosure to St. Brigid that the soldiers who crucified our Lord cruelly injured the veins and arteries, so that He was bleeding from internal as well as outward wounds). The reading is not fruitful. In his introduction the author finds fault with the New Testament writing, because it pictures Jesus as a glutton, in that he ate meat and drank wine. It records also "outburst of indignation, harsh (does he mean stern?) judgments against individuals, His acceptance of the homage of men and women," etc. No real prophet or teacher could do such things, the book declares. After that, we turn over the pages at random. St. Paul receives a large share of condemnation. The author says St. Paul "did not know the Master," and that he made the whole process of Redemption "historical rather than experimental, objective instead of subjective." I wonder how the author would explain Galatians iv, 19: "My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you." Then we find the Adoration of the Magi explained as reverence of the three principles for the soul. The Angels and shepherds, the Temptations in the Wilderness, the death of Lazarus and the Miracles are explained away as effectually as any Higher Critic would do, though in a different manner. Finally we come to the statement that the offering up of Isaac was a "soullic" event. We read no further.

All of the great religious leaders taught their disciples to meditate upon the Life and Passion. In such meditations, they taught, many spiritual truths are disclosed. We are quite ready to believe that the narratives of the four Gospels are fragmentary, and that there is much to be garnered about the Master's work in Judea. But we do believe that the Gospel narratives are in the main authentic, as far as they go. The much-talked-of divergences are precious because they reveal the individuality of the writer—different points of view of a towering personality. Modern revelations about Christ must, we think, continue faithful to the Gospel outline. They will fill it out. They will supplement, not contradict. Thus they will portray a true individual of flesh and blood, not a vaporous spook.

JOHN WILFRID ORR.

Principal Forsyth, in a recent number of *The Hibbert Journal,* has made some statements about the *Humanity* of Jesus, and His towering *Human* qualities, which it would be well to use as a touchstone for everything that purports to be a revelation about the Master. Among other things, Principal Forsyth writes:

"His wit is well recognised—His gracious wit and His wounding wit; but He is charged with the lack of humour, of an element so great, if not essential, in humanity as humour. And some of His servants who possessed the gift have thought it stood in their way for His work. But it is not that Jesus had none, but that He had not the Western, Shakespearean, modern type. He had the type that goes with the prophet's genius, with the genius of Israel, the genius of ethical insight and exaltation, the genius of Isaiah, of Socrates, of Paul, of Pascal. He had irony, as all these had. He not only saw the irony of the world, but He exercised upon His foes the lofty irony of God. What was His silence before Pilate? Or "those ninety and nine just persons that *need no repentance*"? It betokens the deepest foundation, and the repose of unearthly power, to be able amid crises to play so freely about life as His insight and irony did. The odd thing is that, while the sunny Shakespearean humour, or the genial humour of daily life, is not felt by most Christian people to be foreign to Christ, or at least to Christian faith, the ironic humour, tending to the bitter, is so felt. As if Jesus was never bitter and sarcastic! How bitter was that, "It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem"! The Bible has much more room for the humour of Carlyle than for that of Scott, for the grim than for the sunny. Nothing could show more clearly than this soft horror of irony and of scorn for the quack, how far the popular Christian mind had gone from the Christ of the Gospels, how the conception of the loving Jesus, being overdriven, has demoralised the Christian public, how false is the mere genial Jesus, or the merely domestic Jesus of fireside faith, how greatly we need to be forced back on the virility, what I might call the firstrate-mindedness, of this passionate Man, on His moral realism, on His sense of law, and holiness, and wrath, and of the bitter shams and incongruities of life—and of the religious life not least."

The Constructive Quarterly: A journal of the faith, work and thought of Christendom. Edited by Silas McBee. (New York, George H. Doran Company. London, Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press.) To those within the Christian church who have sorrowfully resigned themselves to its divisions, thinking them to be inevitable, to the constantly growing group of church members who look toward a closer union of the denominations as the goal of some future generation for which this generation can at most pave the way, and to those religious or merely well-intentioned people without the church to whom the divisions of Christendom have been ground for regret or contempt, the establishment of *The Constructive Quarterly* must come as a surprise and an inspiration. In the first number, March, 1913, the purpose and policy of the magazine is outlined.

The editors believe that "a constructive treatment of Christianity will make for a better understanding between the isolated Communions of Christendom. It is called *The Constructive Quarterly* because it attempts to build on what the Christian churches are actually believing, doing and thinking. The destructive method has had its full opportunity and will continue to have it and ought to have it. But it has developed no power to unite and is most effective in promoting division.

"The plan is to bring together members of all Communions who will write constructively of the Christianity they profess and practise, in order that others may know their Communion as they themselves would desire to have it known. It is not neutral territory that is sought, where courtesy and diplomacy would naturally tend to avoid issues and to round off the sharp edges of truth and conviction, but rather common ground, where loyalty to Christ and to convictions

about Him and His church will be secure from the tendency to mere compromise and artificial comprehension. The purpose is to create an atmosphere of natural confidence, of mutual knowledge, of mutual desire for fellowship. In such an atmosphere it should be easier to believe in others at their best, without minimizing the real causes of separation.

"*The Constructive Quarterly* recognizes the need that is finding expression in every organized Christian Church—the need of the impact of the whole of Christianity on the Race." "It offers itself as a Forum where the isolated churches of Christendom may reintroduce themselves to one another through the things that they themselves positively hold to be vital to Christianity." "Two conditions are imposed: First, that the Faith and Work and Thought of each Communion shall be presented in its absolute integrity including and not avoiding differences; and second, that no attack with polemical animus shall be made on others."

Not more astonishing is the purpose and spirit of *The Constructive Quarterly* than the magnitude of the scale on which is it carried out. The Editorial Board is composed of men of thought, scholarship and action, each representing some organized Christian body in America, Germany, Russia, Great Britain, India, or other country, and the whole, therefore, representative of the corporate Christianity of the world.

As might be expected, the topic most prominent in the first two numbers is church union. This subject is treated both practically and theoretically, both from the standpoint of present and future possibilities. The views of writers, differing widely in their outlook are set side by side. Sometimes the author's religious standpoint is the theme and his view of church unity appears incidentally; sometimes church unity is definitely the theme and the author's own viewpoint or denominational affiliation must be inferred from his handling of the subject.

L. E. P.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

QUESTION 158.—*From one quarter and another we hear, when there is criticism of the political and social conditions prevailing in Christian countries, that the life Jesus came to preach and to exemplify has not yet been lived, that Christianity as he conceived it has not been "tried." But it is now nearly two thousand years old. What is the case with other religions—are they more fully understood, more truly lived by the rank and file of the people who come under them? How is it with Buddhism and Mohamedanism—have they been "tried" and "lived" as Christianity has not, or are they in the same case?*

ANSWER.—In the QUARTERLY for October, 1912, in the Notes and Comments, "The Western Avatar," passages are quoted from H. P. B. which suggest the answer to this question: that the Buddha came to a nation ripe and ready to receive him, willing and able to understand his message; that the Western Avatar came to a field adverse and unprepared, working for a distant future, for a day which even now is dawning, nay, has already dawned.

One cannot fairly compare the teaching of the Arabian seer with the *avatars* of these two great Masters; though much may have been done, through mystical movements, to enrich his religion from within. C. J.

QUESTION 159.—*Have we warrant for taking literally the saying of Jesus: "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me . . . and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him?"*

ANSWER.—He manifested himself to St. Paul often after the Resurrection. Also to St. John at Patmos. St. Francis saw Him. St. Catherine talked with Him. St. Gertrude knew Him intimately. And so have many others. A.

ANSWER.—According to the testimony of any saint, mystic or spiritual writer of whom we have record, this saying should be taken literally. According to all Scriptures, Eastern or Western, the answer would seem to be an unqualified affirmative. If St. John, St. Paul, St. Peter and the other Apostles are not sufficient witnesses, and if the great Catholic saints such as St. Augustine, St. Catherine of Siena or St. Teresa of Avila are not accepted, similar testimony may be found in such Protestant writers as Wesley, Fox, Pusey and Murray. May not the trouble be a desire to have a manifestation made in terms and according to the wishes of the aspirant rather than to leave it to the Master Himself? G. V. S. M.

ANSWER.—May it not be supposed that we can only gauge the truth of such a statement in one way—by trying? This is an *experimental* science. C. J.

ANSWER.—We have every warrant for taking with absolute literalness this saying of Jesus. The Saints and Mystics of all ages have reiterated it with

astounding certainty and joy. "O taste and see!" they have cried. "He that doeth the will shall know the doctrine"; "Come home, come home, and *know!*" "God," said St. Augustine, "is the home of the Soul." The Mystics, like mountaineers, go ahead to show us the way to freedom, to reality, to peace. The manifestations of the Lord press incessantly upon us; in some most unexpected moment, in the common breaking of bread, He may make himself known to us, as to the disciples at Emmaus. "Behold, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world,"—living in us and with us, a worker, a guest at every table—recognized or unrecognized, a sharer in all the experiences of life. He came forth into humanity never again to leave us, making significant the most trivial aspects of our common daily life. Only remember the promise is to him "That hath my commandments and *keepeth* them." Y.

ANSWER.—Yes, but your answer will never be found in words. *Try* taking Christ literally, do something now, this moment, toward learning to keep his commandments. In the doing lies your answer. B.

QUESTION 160.—*We are taught that when the pupil is ready the Master comes. How may we know when the Master comes?*

ANSWER.—I should think one would know from the fact itself. If a person is learning to swim or to play on some musical instrument, there comes a time when he *knows* he can swim or command the instrument. The process may have been so gradual that it would be difficult to point out the precise moment that separates the period of inability from the period of mastery. Yet the two periods are distinct. So with discipleship. When the middle wall of partition is broken down between the pupil and the Master, the pupil KNOWS. J. W. O.

ANSWER.—Again and again writers in THE QUARTERLY and all through Theosophical literature have told us that the essence of Theosophy is contained in three rules, surviving from the outer work in Egypt, through the great monastic orders, and now embodied in the Three Vows of "Poverty, chastity and obedience." It might be interesting to apply these rules in answering this question: If one were truly self-less, desiring nothing for one's self, seeking no reward, one would not ask or expect the Master to take His time and strength from His other work to come to one and so, in the power of real humility, would find strength not to worry about His time for coming. "Charity" meant and should to-day mean far more than our modern connotation—if we were truly "purged," to use that fine old mystical phrase, we should seek to get rid of the selfish desire that the Master should come to us. If we are obedient, all-absorbed in Him, we would never ask when He is coming or ask why He does not come. These rules seem to teach us that when the pupil is ready the Master will come but that the pupil may certainly know he is not ready and that, therefore, the Master will not come, so long as he thinks he is ready and cannot understand why the Master does not hurry. This is a hard doctrine to any one not imbued with the joyous acceptance of discipleship. It is a comforting doctrine when one gives oneself utterly into the hands of the Teacher and lets Him (as He will) assume responsibility for results while one studies hard and faithfully without a single worry; which means without a thought of self. HEINRICH KLEIN.

QUESTION 161.—*Why is it that a new student so often is checked in his progress, weakened in his desire by the self-question: Am I sincere? What should be done to meet this doubt? What attitude maintained?*

ANSWER.—Tennyson says something about doubt being "devil-born." To me this means that when the more apparent resistance of the lower nature has been

overcome, the stubborness of the lower nature cunningly adopts new plans. It no longer opposes openly, but it subtly whispers doubts as to fitness, sincerity, etc. Doubt came to Dante *after* he had awaked from long sleep in the gloomy forest. The only way to meet doubt is to disbelieve it. A. W.

ANSWER.—Is a student sincere when he thinks about himself so much? Would not the way to meet such a doubt be to try sincerity; in other words to think about the Master and the Teachings of Theosophy, instead of himself? Would not the proper attitude be to do some work, say reading some books recommended by a more advanced student in whom he had confidence, and taking the attitude of acceptance with self-forgetfulness? G. MACK.

ANSWER.—After one has spent the years that we know of, and perhaps many, many lives that we cannot recollect, in proving how foolish he is, it is not surprising that we should fail to recognize our improvement when we begin to show symptoms of being wise. He who follows one pleasure, one passion after another, learns the true meaning, the true horror of futility, and feels the hopelessness of all sensation. He may be punished by seeing only sensation, when consciousness first awakens and, in besotted state, say "I am insincere"—meaning, "Horrors, there is another sensation." If the mind were not colored and clouded by past experiences the Truth would be more recognizable. Fortunately we have been told how the mind may be cleansed so that through it the Real Man may look Upward—which is to give one's self to Instruction. If the inquirer be really desirous he might try the experiment of not thinking about "himself," "his insincerity," but go to the Master humbly for teaching. Humility would seem the right attitude.

HEINRICH KLEIN.

QUESTION 162.—*Why do we find it so difficult to obey the authority that we heartily recognize?*

ANSWER.—Paul of Tarsus has treated this question with great sincerity and force: "What I would, that I do not; but what I hate, that I do. . . . I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inner man: but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" (Romans, vii, 15-24). It is a question of the psychic body, which still bears the impress of many past acts of self-indulgence and disobedience, the momentum of which persists, and makes it difficult to obey, even when we heartily so wish, in that part of our nature which Paul calls "the inner man." But we need find no cause for discouragement here. For the law of momentum acts even more powerfully in the case of good efforts. Indeed, it is the accumulated weight of these good acts of will which, in the fulness of time, carries us through the Gates of Gold. Therefore, go forward like a good soldier; always do your best, knowing that the angels fight on your side. C. J.

ANSWER.—The answer to the question might be given in Wordsworth's lines

> "The world is too much with us, late and soon,
> Getting and spending, we lay waste our powers."

Should we direct these powers, "one-pointed," towards learning the will of the authority we heartily recognize, and having learned, set out to *do* the will, the difficulty would grow less with each act of obedience. S. W. A.

QUESTION 163.—*In order to be eligible for membership in the Theosophical Society must one believe in Reincarnation, Karma, Kama-Loka, Devachan, Mahatmas and Magic?*

ANSWER.—Decidedly not. It is not necessary for one to accept any or all. To many these words represent doctrines that are too new and startling and quite impossible to be comprehended at once. They may be put quietly aside, with the assurance that so far as they are Truths pertaining to the spiritual nature, a comprehension of their meaning will sooner or later come to the faithful student. There are other people to whom these truths come as cooling draughts to parched lips. They afford a rational solution to many otherwise unsolvable problems of life. The one essential qualification for membership in the Theosophical Society is acceptance of the principle of Universal Brotherhood, which in its practical operation looks to the greatest good of Humanity without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste or color. A mere belief in this principle is not enough; one must work conscientiously and untiringly for its realization. He may believe in a God or in no God; he may give adherence to any creed, religion or philosophy, or he may hold to none; these are purely personal matters pertaining to himself alone. What is required is that he act daily and hourly acccording to his highest light, and that he exercise that strict toleration and pure charity toward all men which he rightfully claims for himself. When one's life is ordered on these lines, growth and progress are assured; for by considering the rights of all others as equal to his own and by assisting them to the extent of his power, he is killing by disuse, the groveling propensities of his own lower nature. Whoever thus earnestly strives, attains a knowledge of the verities of life, his whole nature becomes attuned to the harmonies of all Being, and as his interior senses develop he begins to get glimpses of that high destiny which is man's birthright.

W. M. T.

T·S·ACTIVITIES

THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

British National Branch

The Annual Convention of the British National Branch was held at the Royal Arcade Assembly Rooms, Pilgrim Street, Newcastle-on-Tyne, June 8, 1913. The meeting was called to order by the General Secretary at 3.30 P. M. After organization and the election of officers, Mr. Hardy as chairman and Mr. Ayre as Convention Secretary, greetings were read from Mr. Charles Johnston as Chairman of the Executive Committee T. S. (New York), Mr. Walter H. Maddison and Mr. Patterson, Mr. Basil Cuddon, Mr. W. H. Edwards, Miss Trood, and Mr. Paul Raatz (Berlin Branch), and a telegram from Mrs. Keightley.

Brooklyn, New York, May 13, 1913.

To the Members of the Theosophical Society in England, Greetings!

Fellow Members: It is my privilege and pleasure to write to you, at the direction of the Annual Convention of the Theosophical Society, to return our heartiest thanks for the Greetings which you so cordially sent us through Dr. Keightley, whom we love and revere.

The note of the Convention was the deepening of Theosophical consciousness, in the world in general, and in the Theosophical Society in particular. It was felt that, because of this deepening consciousness, the Convention just held was the most vital in the history of the Theosophical movement, carrying a rich promise for the time to come.

I am directed also to convey to you the sincerest good wishes and warmest good will for your own work during the coming year. You share the splendid opportunities which open before all who work in this movement. You share, therefore, the great responsibilities which go with these opportunities. May we all rise to our opportunities and show ourselves equal to our responsibilities, to that end drawing on the deep reservoirs of spiritual power ever within reach of those who have faith and trust and love.

Fraternally and cordially yours,

CHARLES JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Executive Committee, T. S.

The Secretary of the Convention was directed to reply with best thanks for the fraternal good wishes.

REPORT OF THE GENERAL SECRETARY

This last year has been one of quiet and steady growth, and the members and Branches have demonstrated an increasing activity. This has been greatest in the north of England, where the most active centres are situated. There has been activity in Norfolk, where the charter of a new Branch has been issued. On the

Agenda you will see that a place has been reserved for the discussion of Branch Work, and of the steps to make this more markedly effective.

There has been a considerable increase in the number of members who have joined the T. S., twenty-three in all, and I regret to have to record the death of Mrs. Mackie, one of our oldest members, in Glasgow. We have also to regret the resignation of four members. We thus have a net gain of eighteen, as compared with four last year.

The Treasurer's Report* will be laid before you, and this shows a satisfactory condition. There is a satisfactory balance and it may be wise to consider whether we shall forward a donation to the QUARTERLY fund, since our American brethren generously send each of us a copy. Although many of us subscribe directly, all are not able to do so, and I think we may very well in this manner recognize our obligation so far as we are able.

I am glad to say that I have heard from New York that the balance in the hands of the Treasurer has very much increased, and also the list of members. Thus their devoted work is telling and we may be glad to congratulate them. On behalf of the British National Branch I sent a letter of greeting to the Convention and received in reply from Mr. Charles Johnston, the Chairman, a greeting to our present Convention.

The Report of the Corresponding Secretary to the Executive Committee will also be laid before you for consideration.

The Report of the Pamphlet Committee* will be laid before you. Certain changes in method have been made and these, I think, will add to the efficacy of the work and the distribution and number of the Pamphlets printed.

The increase of the circulation both of the THEOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY and of the pamphlets would, I think, be a very admirable mode of spreading the knowledge of the philosophy, and much may be done by lending and giving copies to friends who may evince their interest.

ARCHIBALD KEIGHTLEY,
General Secretary, British National Branch.

June 8, 1913.

On the motion of Mrs. Bagnell, the Report was adopted.

REPORT OF THE CORRESPONDING SECRETARY TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR 1912-13.

Oulton Lodge, Aylsham, Norfolk.

It was decided at the Convention last year, to continue the Correspondence plan for another year, at any rate; but I regret that I am unable to give a more encouraging report of this branch of the work. While in certain individual cases there has been a steady and successful effort to fulfil the duties of Branch Corresponding Secretary with method and regularity, there has been no apparent demand for letters from the members in general; and my letters have not been answered in most cases. One or two people who wrote with apparent interest and enthusiasm, have since dropped off—perhaps because the answers they received were not what they expected, or from other causes of which I know nothing. The Corresponding Secretary for the South Shields Branch has written to me regularly, reporting and commenting on the work of the Branch; her letters have been very interesting, and I am told that my letters to the Branch are appreciated. While this is the case, in even a single instance, I do not think that the plan can be considered a failure, and I am quite willing to continue to do what I can in this work, if the Convention should decide to continue it. The Corresponding Secretary for the Newcastle Branch has written to me once only, his letter was dated October 31st

* These reports are omitted here, for lack of space.

of last year. I replied to this, but have not since heard from him. A member of the Sunderland Branch has written lately, and I think he would make a good Corresponding Secretary, if he can be persuaded to continue in this post, but he says that he has only taken it up temporarily. A young member has been doing correspondence for the Norfolk Branch, which has now five members.

It is for the Convention to decide what plan shall be followed during the coming year. I much regret my unavoidable absence from the Convention this year, and my consequent inability to take part in any discussion—but I would suggest that, in any case, a Corresponding Secretary to the Executive Committee should again be elected, and that the various Branches should endeavour to continue the work if they can.

ALICE GRAVES.

It was decided to accord a hearty vote of thanks to Mrs. Graves for her past work. On the motion of Mr. Kennedy, seconded by Dr. Keightley, it was agreed to arrange that each Lodge send in an initial Report to the Corresponding Secretary, so that their respective positions might be gauged.

After the election of the customary committees, the question of the time and place of the next Convention was discussed, but ultimately it was moved by Dr. Keightley and seconded by Mr. Wilkinson to hold the next Convention on May 17, 1914; and the place of meeting was left in the hands of the Executive Committee. Carried unanimously.

The Convention adjourned, after a general discussion, at 5.15 P. M.

THOMAS A. AYRE,
Convention Secretary.

68 Saville Street, South Shields, Durham.

AN ADDITION

To the list of Branches represented at the Annual Convention of the T. S., held in New York on April 26th, should be added the name of Newcastle-on-Tyne Lodge, England. This name was inadvertently omitted from the list which appears on page 78 of the July QUARTERLY.

THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE UNION OF GERMAN BRANCHES OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

The Convention of the "Union of German Branches" took place in Munich on Saturday, Sunday and Monday, June 14, 15 and 16, 1913. On Saturday evening, as an introduction to the official session a public lecture was given by Mr. Oskar Stoll, of Berlin, in Museum Hall. Before the lecture Mr. Paul Raatz, as chairman, called attention to the Spirit and Method of the Theosophical Society and emphasized the fact, that the numerous crises, which had taken place in the Theosophical Society were due solely to ignorance in respect to the real spirit of the T. S.; it should, therefore, be a source of great satisfaction to note that this spirit is being better comprehended, not only by members but by those outside the Society.

The subject of Mr. Stoll's lecture was: "The Mission of the Theosophical Society." It was listened to by a large audience, with great interest, and the Munich daily papers gave a very friendly report, calling special attention to the chief points in the lecture, namely, that "Brotherhood" is the sole foundation and principal aim

of the Society and that the secondary aim: the investigation of the psychical powers in man, must in no wise be confused with the development of so-called occult powers. An interesting, harmonious discussion followed, Mr. Max Kolb taking the chair.

The business meeting took place on Sunday. After some words of welcome by Mr. Raatz, the list of delegates was read. Mr. Max Kolb was then chosen chairman, and Dr. Barrenberg, Secretary of the meeting. The Branches in the Union: Aussig, Berlin, Flensburg, Munich, Neusalz and Suhl, were represented either personally or by proxy. Members from Dresden were also present, and we desire to make special mention of the pleasure which Mrs. Binks, from South Shields, England, gave us by being present.

The climax of interest was reached when the letters of greeting from friends in America, England, Norway, Austria and Germany were read, inspiring the Convention, as they did, with strength and increasing consciousness of harmonious unity.

Mr. Raatz gave a report of the Convention in New York, which he had visited personally and from which he had brought back the feeling that there the true spirit of the T. S. had come to life. His report contained a sketch of the history of the Theosophical Society in Germany, of which he has been a member from the beginning. Mrs. Binks gave an account of the work in the North of England, which had increased considerably during the last year. The German branches reported increased life and membership, and the Treasurer's report showed that the finances of the Union were in good condition. The officers of the Union were reëlected, with one exception. In place of Mr. Schoch, who was travelling, Mrs. Frink, Neusalz, was elected as member of the Executive Committee.

A vote of thanks was extended to the Munich Branch for their exceedingly generous hospitality and excellent work in arranging the Convention. Financial support was also granted for our quarterly, *Theosophisches Leben* and a resolution passed to send copies to several German universities, the subscription to be paid by the Union.

On Monday an excursion was made to the famous mountain "Wendelstein," where the fine weather and the wonderful view of the Alpine glaciers made a deep impression on all present, seeming to be a beautiful symbol of all that had been experienced during the days of the Convention.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

ABRIDGMENT OF THE SECRET DOCTRINE, (Hillard)	$2.16
A PRIMER OF THEOSOPHY, by Katherine Hillard	.10
BHAGAVAD GITA, translated by Charles Johnston	1.00
BHAGAVAD GITA, Edited by W. Q. Judge, leather	.75
CABINET SIZE PHOTO, H. P. BLAVATSKY or W. Q. JUDGE	.50
CULTURE OF CONCENTRATION, by W. Q. Judge, paper	.10
DREAM OF RAVAN, cloth	1.00
ESOTERIC BUDDHISM, by A. P. Sinnett, cloth	1.25
FIVE YEARS OF THEOSOPHY	3.25
FRAGMENTS, by Cavé	.50
IDYLL OF THE WHITE LOTUS, cloth	1.00
KARMA: WORKS AND WISDOM, by Charles Johnston	.35
KARMA, by A. P. Sinnett, a novel, cloth	.75
KEY TO THEOSOPHY, by H. P. Blavatsky	2.00
LETTERS THAT HAVE HELPED ME, by W. Q. Judge	
Vol. I, compiled by Jasper Niemand, cloth	.50
Vol. II, compiled by Thomas Green and Jasper Niemand, cloth	.60
LIGHT OF ASIA, by Sir Edwin Arnold, cloth, 75c.; leather	1.00
LIGHT ON THE PATH, cloth, 50c.; leather	.75
MAGIC, WHITE AND BLACK, by Franz Hartmann, M.D., cloth	2.00
MEDITATION, by Henry Bedinger Mitchell	.20
NIGHT-MARE TALES, by H. P. Blavatsky, cloth	.50
OCEAN OF THEOSOPHY, by W. Q. Judge, paper, 50c.; cloth	.75
OCCULT WORLD, by A. P. Sinnett, cloth	1.25
PATANJALI'S YOGA SUTRAS, translated by Charles Johnston	1.25
REINCARNATION, by E. D. Walker, cloth	1.50
REINCARNATION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, by Jas. M. Pryse, paper, 35c.; cloth	.60
SECRET DOCTRINE, by H. P. Blavatsky, Vols. I and II, and Index, cloth.	12.50
SERMON ON THE MOUNT, translated by Jas. M. Pryse, paper, 35c.; cloth	.60
SOME MODERN FAILINGS, Che-Yew-Tsang	.10
TALKS ON RELIGION, by H. B. Mitchell	1.50
THEOSOPHY AS AN INFLUENCE IN LIFE, by Archibald Keightley	.10
THEOSOPHICAL BADGES, gold, 2.50; rolled gold	1.00
THE APOCALYPSE UNSEALED, by James M. Pryse	2.00
THE CREED OF BUDDHA	1.50
THE CREED OF CHRIST	1.25
THE PARABLES OF THE KINGDOM, by Charles Johnston	.20
THE SONG OF LIFE, by Charles Johnston, cloth	.30
THE SPIRITUAL LIFE, by Archibald Keightley	.10
THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY AND THEOSOPHY, by H. B. Mitchell	.20
THE THEOSOPHY OF THE UPANISHADS, by Charles Johnston	1.25
THROUGH THE GATES OF GOLD, cloth	.50
UNITY OF RELIGIONS, by J. W. Keightley	.10
VOICE OF THE SILENCE, by H. P. Blavatsky, cloth, 50c.; leather	.75
VOW OF POVERTY AND OTHER ESSAYS, by Jasper Niemand, paper.	.15

These and any other books on Theosophical, Religious and Philosophical subjects, can be obtained from

THE SECRETARY T. S.,

159 Warren Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

The Theosophical Society

Founded by H. P. Blavatsky at New York in 1875

THE Society does not pretend to be able to establish at once a universal brotherhood among men, but only strives to create the nucleus of such a body. Many of its members believe that an acquaintance with the world's religions and philosophies will reveal, as the common and fundamental principle underlying these, that "spiritual identity of all Souls with the Oversoul" which is the basis of true brotherhood; and many of them also believe that an appreciation of the finer forces of nature and man will still further emphasize the same idea.

The organization is wholly unsectarian, with no creed, dogma, nor personal authority to enforce or impose; neither is it to be held responsible for the opinions of its members, who are expected to accord to the beliefs of others that tolerance which they desire for their own.

The following proclamation was adopted at the Convention of the Society, held at Boston, April, 1895:

"The Theosophical Society in America by its delegates and members in Convention assembled, does hereby proclaim fraternal good will and kindly feeling toward all students of Theosophy and members of Theosophical Societies wherever and however situated. It further proclaims and avers its hearty sympathy and association with such persons and organizations in all theosophical matters except those of government and administration, and invites their correspondence and co-operation.

"To all men and women of whatever caste, creed, race, or religious belief, who aim at the fostering of peace, gentleness, and unselfish regard one for another, and the acquisition of such knowledge of men and nature as shall tend to the elevation and advancement of the human race, it sends most friendly greeting and freely proffers its services.

"It joins hands with all religions and religious bodies whose efforts are directed to the purification of men's thoughts and the bettering of their ways, and it avows its harmony therewith. To all scientific societies and individual searchers after wisdom upon whatever plane, and by whatever righteous means pursued, it is and will be grateful for such discovery and unfoldment of Truth as shall serve to announce and confirm a *scientific basis for ethics*.

"And lastly, it invites to its membership those who, seeking a higher life hereafter, would learn to know the *path* to tread in this."

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Secretary T. S., 159 Warren Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

BROOKLYN EAGLE PRESS